BONEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY

OLD TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION

BONEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY

OLD TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION

GENERAL AND SPECIAL

BY

JOHN HOWARD RAVEN, D. D.

Professor of Old Testament Languages and Exegesis,
Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church
in America, at New Brunswick, N. J.

790

BS
1140
.R253
1910

NEW YORK CHICAGO TORONTO

Fleming H. Revell Company

LONDON AND EDINBURGH

221
R197c

Copyright, 1906, 1910, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 80 Wabash Avenue
Toronto: 27 Richmond Street, W.
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 100 Princes Street

PREFACE

An apology is due to those who read theological books for adding another to the already long list of volumes on the Higher Criticism. The apology is that the great majority of works on this subject are from the negative standpoint, while most of the others are too brief to be of much value, and substitute ridicule for argument. The orthodox theologian weakens his position by undervaluing the force of the radical arguments. He does not commend himself to fair-minded people by ignoring or ridiculing his opponents. The traditional view of the Old Testament has nothing to fear except from the ignorance and the prejudice of its adherents.

The present volume has arisen primarily from the need of a conservative text-book which covers the whole range of the subject. The writer has endeavored to avoid on the one hand that over-conciseness which leaves the student in the dark and on the other that over-fullness which leaves him in a fog. As far as possible the arguments of the liberals are given in their own words, not only to conserve fairness but to encourage the student to read the opposite side of the case. This is the cause of the large number of quotations. The lists of words, parallel passages, and other details which are necessary for the argument in certain parts are intended for reference. It is hoped that they will open the way for individual research. The dates of books are not

meant to be final or exact, but only approximate. The bibliography is select rather than exhaustive. Books accessible to the average student and minister are given the preference. Only those books in a foreign language are mentioned which have not been translated into English and which present the most recent views. Their number is kept at the minimum.

The writer is firmly convinced that this battle must be fought in the open. The insidious nature of the current views of the Old Testament is not realized by many sincere Christians who espouse them. There is no middle ground between a thoroughly naturalistic conception of the origin of the Hebrew scriptures and that view of them which is found in the scriptures themselves. Christ and the Old Testament are so united by mutual testimony that a low view of the credibility of the latter must result in a low view of the credibility of the former. If this book shall do a humble part in confirming the faith of any of Christ's ministers in those ancient books which foretold and prepared for the coming of the Saviour who gave His precious blood for us, the author's labors will be abundantly rewarded.

New Brunswick, N. J.,
January, 1906.

The author has taken the opportunity presented by the appearance of a second edition, to make a few slight corrections as well as to notice certain archæological discoveries of the past four years. A few recent titles are also added to the bibliography.

New Brunswick, N. J.,
February, 1910.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREPARATORY. Definition and History of the Science 11

PART I

General Introduction

I. The Canon 17
II. The Text 43

PART II

Special Introduction

FIRST DIVISION. THE LAW

PRELIMINARY. The Pentateuch in General . . 85
I. Genesis 129
II. Exodus 136
III. Leviticus 143
IV. Numbers 145
V. Deuteronomy 147

SECOND DIVISION. THE PROPHETS

Section 1. The Former Prophets

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT 149
I. Joshua 150
II. Judges 156
III. Samuel 163
IV. Kings 170

Section 2. The Latter Prophets

PAGE

PRELIMINARY. HEBREW PROPHECY 177
I. ISAIAH 185
II. JEREMIAH 199
III. EZEKIEL 204
IV. THE TWELVE 208
1. HOSEA 208
2. JOEL 212
3. AMOS 217
4. OBADIAH 220
5. JONAH 223
6. MICAH 229
7. NAHUM 232
8. HABAKKUK 234
9. ZEPHANIAH 236
10. HAGGAI 239
11. ZECHARIAH 241
12. MALACHI 248

THIRD DIVISION. KETHUBHIM

Section 1. Poetical Books

PRELIMINARY. HEBREW POETRY 251
I. PSALMS 256
II. PROVERBS 267
III. JOB 272

Section 2. Megilloth

I. SONG OF SOLOMON 283
II. RUTH 292
III. LAMENTATIONS 296
IV. ECCLESIASTES 303
V. ESTHER 312

Section 3. Historical Books

PAGE

I. Daniel 317
II. Ezra—Nehemiah 333
1. Ezra 333
2. Nehemiah 339
III. Chronicles 342

TABLE OF DATES OF OLD TESTAMENT BOOKS . 349

BIBLIOGRAPHY 351

PREPARATORY

DEFINITION AND HISTORY OF THE SCIENCE

I. **Definition.** Old Testament Introduction is that branch of Biblical Introduction which relates to the Old Testament. Biblical Introduction formerly was made to include all those subjects which are introductory to the study of the Bible—Biblical Archæology, Geography, Natural History, Hermeneutics, Apologetics, and Criticism. The term is now properly used only of Criticism. Thus Old Testament Introduction is the science which relates to the critical questions of the Old Testament. General Introduction considers the Old Testament as a whole, and discusses (1) the canon in its origin, extent, arrangement, and preservation; and (2) the text in its languages, manuscripts, versions and critical editions. Special Introduction deals with the individual books, considering their authorship, date, purpose, and integrity. Introduction thus includes the Lower and Higher Criticism of which the former strives to restore the original text of the scriptures by a comparison of manuscripts, versions, and quotations, and the latter seeks to examine the genuineness, integrity, and purpose of the books.

II. **History.** The first to use the name "introduction" in relation to the Bible was the Syrian monk Adrian, whose book, "Εἰσαγωγὴ εἰς τὰς θείας γραφάς" appeared about 440 A.D., and was a kind of Biblical

Rhetoric. About 550 A.D., Junilius, Quæstor of the Palace of Justinian at Constantinople, published his "Instituta Regularia Divinæ Legis," of which the first part dealt with the externals of the scriptures—style, authorship, and arrangement of the books. Cassiodorius, a Senator who died about 570 A.D., was the author of a work called "De Institutione Divinarum Litterarum," which served as an Encyclopedia of Theology for the monks of all then known concerning the books of scripture. Practically nothing on this subject has come down to us from the Middle Ages except isolated remarks.

In the period of the *Reformation,* a new interest was awakened in Biblical studies. Elias Levita, a Jewish scholar (1474-1549 A.D.), busied himself with the text and the history of the canon. Two French scholars maintained Levita's liberal views concerning the late origin of the vowel points—Cappellus, a Reformed Theologian, Professor at Saumur (1586-1658 A.D.) and Morinus, a Roman Catholic (died 1659 A.D.). The older view, that the vowel points were a part of the original text, was defended by John Buxtorf the younger (1599-1664 A.D.). Brian Walton, Bishop of Chester, discussed the philological phases of criticism in the "Prolegomena to the London Polyglott" (1657 A.D.).

The modern *Higher Criticism* may be said to date from Spinoza (1632-1677), a Pantheistic philosopher, and Hobbes (1588-1679), an English Rationalist. The former, especially, denied the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, considered the books from Genesis to Kings to be a late compilation possibly by Ezra, brought the Chronicles to a much later time, and affirmed that there was no such thing as a canon before the time of the

Maccabees. Thus he anticipated by two centuries, the conclusions of radical criticism. Richard Simon (1638-1712), a Romish priest, opposed these views with the compromising position that the Hebrew prophets, like the official historians of other Eastern countries, recast the history into its present form long after Moses, and Ezra and his successors collected their works. This theory, in turn, was combated by Clericus (Le Clerc, 1657-1736) and Carpzov (1679-1767), the latter of whom was the author of the first systematic Introduction to the Old Testament (1721 A.D.). In 1753 Jean Astruc, a profligate French physician, promulgated the theory that Moses made use in Genesis of older documents characterized by the use of different divine names. This idea was developed by Eichhorn, Professor at Göttingen and so-called "father of the Higher Criticism," whose learned Introduction to the Old Testament appeared in 1782. The theory of Simon was also developed by Semler the German Rationalist (1725-1791).

In the nineteenth century De Wette (1780-1849) reëdited and enlarged the Introduction of Eichhorn, while Ewald (1803-1875) introduced into the study of critical questions a feeling for the style and development of the doctrine of the books of scripture. A revolt in favor of the old traditional views was led by Hengstenberg (1802-1869) who was followed by Hävernick (died 1845), Keil (1807-1888), and Kurtz (1809-1890). The year 1878 marks a new era in the history of criticism, for in that year appeared Wellhausen's "Prolegomena to the History of Israel," which consistently applied to the Old Testament from beginning to end, the principle of literary and historical development. This view was

advocated by Kuenen (1828-1891) and Reuss (1804-1891) and is still dominant.

In England and America the voluminous "Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures," by Horne, which appeared in 1818, was long the standard. In the tenth edition of this conservative work (1862), Samuel Davidson (1807-1898) introduced a large element of the German Radicalism. These ideas were further popularized in England in 1881 by W. Robertson Smith's (1846-1894) "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church." At the present time, though no university professors in Germany stand upon conservative ground, the extreme views of Duhm and Cornill are opposed by König and Strack. Many pastors, such as Rupprecht and Zahn are thoroughly conservative. In England and America, although the radical views largely predominate, not a few scholars, and probably a majority of the pastors adhere to the conservative ideas. The best-known English work from the standpoint of a moderate criticism is Driver's Introduction. These views are opposed by Dr. James Orr of Glasgow, Canon Girdlestone, and others. The chief defenders of the radical views in America are Toy, Moore, Bacon, Briggs, and Haupt; while they have been opposed by Green, Osgood, Davis, and others.

PART I

General Introduction

I

THE CANON

I. **The Word Canon** is of Greek origin, and meant in the classic authors "any straight rod or bar especially to keep a thing straight," and metaphorically, "anything that serves to determine other things, a rule, a standard." (Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon.) The word is found in this metaphorical sense in two passages of the New Testament (II Cor. 10:13-16, Gal. 6:16). It was used by the Alexandrian grammarians as a name for the classic Greek authors considered as models or standards of excellence, and in modern times of the authoritative decisions of a church council. In relation to the Bible, it is defined as "the books of the Holy Scripture accepted by the Christian church as containing an authoritative rule of religious faith and practice." (Century Dictionary.)

Though the word was not used in this sense in Biblical times, the same idea was attached to the books of the Old Testament. The essential element of the idea is that of authority. It cannot, therefore, be weakened, as Semler and others attempted, to mean a list of books.

II. **Evidence from Scripture.** The *Old Testament* contains no record of the canonization of any book or collection of books, but everywhere recognizes the books as of canonical authority.

1. They were kept in the temple and even in the Holy of Holies. The two tables of the law were preserved in

the ark of the covenant (Ex. 25:21; 40:20; Deut. 10:5; I Kings 8:9) as the most priceless possession of Israel. The book of the law of Moses was given in charge of the Levites to be kept by the side of the ark (Deut. 31:24-26, R.V.). It was found in the temple in the days of Josiah (II Kings 22:8).

2. They were treated as authoritative. The law must be read in the hearing of the people once in seven years (Deut. 31:10-13). The King was to have a copy and to regulate his decisions according to the law (Deut. 17:18-20). Joshua, the successor of Moses, was enjoined: "This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth" (Josh. 1:8). The kings were judged according to obedience to the law (I Sam. 15:11-23; I Kings 11:38; II Chron. 8:13; I Kings 14:7-16; II Kings 14:6; 18:6; 21.2-16). The people were repeatedly urged to obey it (II Chron. 14:4; 17:9; II Kings 23:3, 24-25). Both Israel and Judah are said to have been carried captive to Babylon because of disobedience to it (II Kings 17:7-23; 18:11-12; Dan. 9:11-13; Neh. 1:7-9). The law was recognized immediately by those who returned (Ezra 3:2; Neh. 8:1-8; 10:28-29; 13:1-3).

3. The deference to the prophets was not less than that paid to the law. The prophets emphasized the law (Is. 1:10) but considered their own words equally binding. Disobedience to the prophets was equally punishable (II Kings 17:13; Neh. 9:29-30; Dan. 9:5-6; Zech. 7:12). These prophetic utterances were perpetuated in an authoritative set of books to which Daniel refers (Dan. 9:2).

Thus while the Old Testament does not give any information concerning the formation of the canon or its

extent, it is explicit, as far as it goes, in bearing testimony to the existence in very early times of an authoritative body of books.

In this respect the *New Testament* is in perfect accord with the Old.

1. Our Lord and his apostles make frequent quotations from the Old Testament in proof of their assertions and teaching. Many things are said to have occurred in Christ's life "that the scripture might be fulfilled." Scripture is always considered authoritative (Matt. 22:29; Jno. 5:39; 10:35, etc.) and it is said to have been inspired of God (II Tim. 3:16; Heb. 1:1; II Peter 1:20-21).

2. If it be inquired what books were included in the term "scripture," the New Testament had the same canon of the Old Testament which we possess. All the books are quoted except Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Obadiah, Nahum, and Zephaniah. The last three of these books were part of the Minor Prophets which were counted as one book by the Jews. Allusion to other parts of the book therefore sanctions the whole. The divisions of the canon are mentioned—the law and the prophets (Matt. 5:17; 7:12; 11:13, etc.), as a comprehensive name for the entire canon, and "the law of Moses, the prophets, and the Psalms" (Luke 24:44). In the last passage the Psalms does not stand for the third division as its first book. Yet the placing of one book of the third division side by side with the first and second divisions, shows that all books which at the time of Christ belonged to the third division were considered canonical. And that the limits of the canon were the same in Christ's time as now, is shown by our Lord's alluding to Genesis and

Chronicles as the first and last books of scripture. This he does in Matt. 23:35, "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, the son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar." This expression cannot have meant "from the beginning to the end of your history" since the murder of Zacharias occurred in the ninth century, B.C., far from the end of Israel's history (II Chron. 24:20-21). It must mean "from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Chronicles" or as we commonly say "from Genesis to Malachi." By these words our Lord shows that the canon in his time began with Genesis and ended with Chronicles, and that these limits were fixed as in our Hebrew Bibles to-day. Everything included between these two limits was considered authoritative.

III. **Order of Books.** In the Hebrew scriptures, the books are arranged in three divisions according to their authors.

1. The Law: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy.
2. The Prophets.
   (*a*) The Former Prophets: Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings.
   (*b*) The Latter Prophets: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Twelve.
3. The Kethubhim.
   (*a*) The Poetical Books: Psalms, Proverbs, Job.
   (*b*) The Megilloth: Song, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther.
   (*c*) Non-Prophetic Historical Books: Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles.

In the Septuagint, Vulgate, and modern versions, the books are arranged according to their subject matter:

1. The Law: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy.

2. The Historical Books: Joshua, Judges, Ruth, I and II Samuel, I and II Kings, I and II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther.

3. The Poetical Books: Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon.

4. The Prophetical Books: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the twelve Minor Prophets.

IV. **Critical Theory.** These three divisions are considered by the critics to indicate three successive collections of the canon. The dates and authorship of the various books are made to control the view of the formation of the canon. Moses did not write the Pentateuch. A moderate position in this respect is that of Ryle who says: "Just as in Deut. 31:9-24 Moses himself is said to have committed to writing the law, which formed the nucleus of the Deuteronomic legislation, so we understand the legislation which was initiated by Moses to have become expanded into the complex system of laws included in the Pentateuch. The great Lawgiver who was the founder became also the personification of Hebrew legislation, as David was of the poetry and Solomon of the Wisdom of Israel" (Canon of the Old Testament, p. 31). The first canon was the book which was discovered in the temple in 621 B.C. This is said to have been Deuteronomy and to have become canonical by the acceptance of the people (II Kings 23:1-2). According to some critics, Leviticus was composed before the Exile, while others maintained that during the Exile

Israel committed to writing the priestly legislation and the remainder of the Pentateuch in order to perpetuate the institutions and history of the nation. These portions likewise became canonical when the people heard and accepted them at the Feast of Tabernacles (Neh. 8).

The books of the Prophets underwent a period of private circulation during which their religious value was tested. Their canonization was the work of the scribes and was a gradual process. Buhl considers 300 B.C. the date of closing the canon of the Prophets, while Wildeboer and others suggest 200 B.C.

Some of the books of the Kethubhim are thought to have been in existence when the canon of the Prophets was closed but several of them are assigned to a later time. Daniel and several Psalms are said to be from the Maccabean age (B.C. 170 and later). The critics differ concerning the date of the final closing of this third division. Buhl and Ryle believe that the entire canon was closed before the time of Christ. Wildeboer, although he admits that the third division was substantially as at present, asserts that the whole canon was not definitely settled until about 200 A.D. by the Mishna. Others give the date of the Council of Jabne or Jammia (A.D. 90, 108).

The *arguments of the critics* for their theory of the canon are thus summarized by Green: (General Introduction. The Canon pp. 23-25.)

1. Several books were not in existence in the time of Ezra (Eccl., Esther, Dan., Chron., and several Psalms). This question will be discussed under Special Introduction.

2. The three divisions indicate three stages of col-

lection. If the books of the second and third divisions had been arranged at the same time, Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles would have been classified with Samuel and Kings, while Daniel would stand among the Latter Prophets. The fact that they are in the third division is said to prove that only that division remained open at the time they were produced.

3. The Samaritans receive only the Pentateuch. Hence it is argued that the other books could not have been in existence and canonical when the Samaritans received the Pentateuch from the Jews.

4. The synagogue lessons were at first taken exclusively from the Law. Sections of the Prophets were added later while the Kethubhim were read only on special occasions and in small sections.

5. The use of the terms "The Law" and "The Law and the Prophets" for the entire Old Testament is thought to be a reminiscence of the time when the first and then the first two divisions comprised the entire canon.

6. Certain points in the order of the books of the Prophets and Kethubhim favor, it is said, a gradual formation.

7. The disputes of the Jews concerning certain books of the Kethubhim show that the canon was not fixed.

V. **The Test of Canonicity.** The critics differ widely concerning the principle according to which some books were received into the canon and others excluded.

1. Eichhorn considered age the test.

Answer.—The historical books refer to "the Book of the Wars of Jehovah" and "the Book of Jashar." Yet these older books were excluded from the canon.

2. Hitzig and others made the Hebrew language the test of canonicity.

Answer.—Ecclesiasticus, Tobit and I Maccabees were originally written in Hebrew but excluded from the canon.

3. Wildeboer makes conformity to the law the test of canonicity for the later books. He says, "The question whether a book is canonical or not from the Jewish point of view amounts to this: Does it agree with the revelation, that is, with the Tora or not?" (Origin of the Canon, p. 97.) Yet later he introduces several other tests for the Kethubhim. "There were admitted into it only books written in Hebrew or Aramaic, which treated of the ancient history (Ruth, Chron.) or gave information about the establishment of the new order of things (Ezra, Neh.) or which were supposed to have been written by some famous person of ancient times (Prov., Eccl., Song, Sam., Dan., perhaps Job also), while Esther obtained admission after much controversy (as was the case with Eccl.) because it was in complete harmony with the national sentiment of people and scribes alike" (p. 139).

Answer.—This is pure theorizing with no historical evidence. Though undoubtedly no book was received into the canon which was opposed to the Pentateuch, certainly the Old Testament does not include all the books in agreement with it. It is incredible that several different tests should have been applied in the way suggested.

4. The more common view is that the books were tested by their religious use privately for a shorter or longer period before they were admitted to the canon.

Answer.—This plausible theory does not go to the root of the matter. The question remains: why were certain books edifying and others not? Canonicity must have been a quality of the books from the first.

All these theories are at fault in considering the canonization of the Old Testament books as the work of the people. Canonical authority and the recognition of it are two distinct things. That the decision of the people was not the cause of canonicity is proven by three considerations.

1. Authority in those times was not conceived of as coming from the people but from God. This critical theory would force into ancient times the principles of modern civilization. The books must have possessed canonical authority before they were recognized by Israel, or Israel would not have recognized them. Their recognition was the effect and not the cause of their canonicity. They were canonical because divinely inspired, and possessed divine authority from their first promulgation.

2. The two accounts of so-called canonization are not really such. The so-called canonization of the book of Deuteronomy in the time of Josiah is not canonization at all. The book was recognized as already authoritative by all who read it. Hilkiah said to Shaphan: "I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord" (II Kings 22:8)—evidently an authoritative book of which he had heard but which had been lost. Shaphan read the book before Josiah the King. The king immediately rent his clothes and commanded that inquiry be made of the Lord concerning the words of the book saying: "Great is the wrath of the Lord that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not harkened unto

the words of this book, to do according unto all that which is written concerning us" (verse 13). Josiah gathered the people together and read the book to them (II Kings 23:1-2). The whole impression of this account is of a book already canonical, rather than of the canonization of the book.

Likewise the record of Nehemiah 8 is not that of the canonization of a book. Ezra evidently considered the book as already canonical, or he would not have taken such pains to read it at the solemn assembly of the people. The people had the same idea of it for they asked Ezra to read it (Neh. 8:1-3), "and when he opened it, all the people stood up" (verse 5) as an evidence of this authority. The reading was for the instruction of the people. Their acceptance added no authority to the book either for them or for their descendants, but was the recognition of previously existing authority.

3. There is no record in the Old Testament of the formal acceptance by the people of any of the books of the second and third divisions of the canon. Yet these books were evidently considered canonical. It is a pure assumption that their canonization was the work of the scribes. If either the acceptance of the people or the official imprimatur of the scribes made books canonical, the recording of that act of canonization would be an important part of each book, or at least of each division of the canon. Yet no such record exists. The explanation is obvious that the books were recognized as canonical from the first. The very contents of the books show that the prophets spoke with authority. If therefore their spoken words were divinely authoritative, why not their written words?

VI. External Evidence.

1. *From Jewish Sources.*—The author of the prologue to the book of *Ecclesiasticus* (about 130 B. C.) says: "Whereas many and great things have been delivered to us by the Law and the Prophets and by others that have followed their steps—my grandfather Jesus when he had much given himself to the reading of the Law and the Prophets and other books of our fathers and had gotten therein good judgment, was drawn on also himself to write something pertaining to learning and wisdom." If we make a due allowance for the difference between the date of the prologue and the date of the book, this passage shows that not later than 170 B.C. the Old Testament canon was divided into the same three divisions found in the Hebrew scriptures to-day.

The testimony of *Josephus* who was born at Jerusalem A.D. 37 is much more explicit. In his work against Apion he says: "We have not tens of thousands of books, discordant and conflicting, but only twenty-two containing the record of all time, which have been justly believed to be divine. And of these five are the books of Moses, which embrace the laws and the tradition from the creation of man until his death.—From the death of Moses to the reign of Artaxerxes, the successor of Xerxes, king of Persia, the prophets who succeeded Moses wrote what was done in thirteen books. The remaining four books embrace hymns to God and counsels for men for the conduct of life. From Artaxerxes until our time everything has been recorded but has not been deemed worthy of like credit with what preceded, because the exact succession of the prophets ceased. But what faith we have placed in our own writings is evident by our conduct: for though so long a time

has now passed, no one has dared either to add anything to them, or to take anything from them, or to alter anything in them. But it is instinctive in all Jews at once from their very birth to regard them as commands of God, and to abide by them and, if need be, willingly to die for them." This testimony bears on three points: the authority, extent, and date of the completion of the Old Testament. Concerning the authority no further comment is necessary. The twenty-two books mentioned indicate the extent of the canon. They are probably,

1. Genesis
2. Exodus
3. Leviticus
4. Numbers
5. Deuteronomy
6. Joshua
7. Judges (with Ruth)
8. Samuel
9. Kings
10. Isaiah
11. Jeremiah (with Lamentations)
12. Ezekiel
13. The Twelve Minor Prophets
14. Psalms
15. Proverbs
16. Job
17. Song of Solomon
18. Ecclesiastes
19. Esther
20. Daniel
21. Ezra and Nehemiah
22. Chronicles

This enumeration is made from the statements of Josephus himself and from the known classifications of other ancient writers. The five books of Moses are sufficiently identified. The four books which "embrace hymns to God and counsels for men for the conduct of life" are probably Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Song of Solomon. It is known from Origen and others that Ruth was sometimes counted with Judges and

Lamentations with Jeremiah. If so the thirteen books of the prophets who succeeded Moses would be:

1. Joshua
2. Judges (with Ruth)
3. Samuel
4. Kings
5. Chronicles
6. Ezra and Nehemiah
7. Esther
8. Job
9. Isaiah
10. Jeremiah (with Lamentations)
11. Ezekiel
12. Daniel
13. The Minor Prophets

This arrangement is peculiar to Josephus but suited his purpose, which concerned chiefly the reliability of the historical books. Hence all books containing an element of history were classed by themselves. Thus the canon of Josephus included all the books we possess and no others. This fact is further confirmed by his quoting all of those books as authoritative, except Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Solomon, none of which contained material for his history.

The testimony of Josephus to the time of the completion of the canon is most explicit—"the reign of Artaxerxes, the son of Xerxes, king of Persia." This was Artaxerxes Longimanus who reigned 465-425 B.C. In his seventh year (458 B.C.) Ezra went up to Jerusalem (Ezra 7:1-8) and in his twentieth year (445 B.C.) Nehemiah followed him (Neh, 2:1-6). It does not invalidate the testimony of Josephus that he identified the Artaxerxes of Ezra and Nehemiah with Xerxes, and the Ahasuerus of Esther with Artaxerxes—the exact reverse of the fact. For in any case the canon is said to have been complete in the reign of the later monarch. The statement of Josephus was made as the current opinion of his people. He was a man of great learning

for his time, and would certainly make no unguarded assertions in a controversy with such a scholar as Apion. His testimony therefore is worthy of the utmost confidence.

The statement of the *Talmud* is valuable because it mentions the books in detail. "Moses wrote his own book and the section concerning Balaam and Job. Joshua wrote his own book and eight verses of the Law. Samuel wrote his own book and Judges and Ruth. David wrote the book of Psalms at the direction of (עַל יְדֵי) ten elders, Adam, Melchizedek, Abraham, Moses, Heman, Jeduthun, Asaph and the three sons of Korah. Jeremiah wrote his own book and the Book of Kings and Lamentations. Hezekiah and his college wrote Isaiah, Proverbs, the Song of Songs and Koheleth. The men of the Great Synagogue wrote Ezekiel, the Twelve [Minor Prophets] Daniel and Esther. Ezra wrote his own book and the genealogies of the Book of Chronicles as far as himself." While all these views concerning authorship may not be accepted, the passage implies agreement concerning the extent of the canon and includes precisely the books in our Hebrew Bibles.

Two of the critical objections bear upon this point—viz. that from the Samaritan Pentateuch and that from the synagogue lessons. Whatever be the date of the Samaritan Pentateuch, it does not prove that the Jews possessed no other canonical books at the time the Samaritans took the books of Moses from them. The Samaritans refused to take the other books because those books sanctioned the worship at Shiloh and Jerusalem instead of Mt. Gerizim. Therefore the Samaritans also altered the text of the Pentateuch to give greater reverence to their holy mountain. The synagogue read-

ings give no information concerning the date of the canonization of the Prophets. Wildeboer admits that as early as the Maccabees it was customary to read a section of the Prophets with the section of the Law. In the time of Christ the same was the case though the readings in use were different from those in our Hebrew Bibles (Luke 4:16-19; Acts 13:14-15). Thus as far back as our knowledge goes we find the Prophets read with the Law. If there were a time when the Law only was read, it would only prove that the Rabbins did not consider the other books adapted to public reading, not that originally only the Pentateuch was canonical.

2. *From Christian Sources.*—The Christians received their canon from the Jews. This process is well described by Reuss: "Those of the believers who belonged to the Jewish nation did not cease to frequent the synagogue—to them the public reading of the sacred books continued therefore to be a familiar practice. They soon introduced into their own special meetings, even before their final separation, the same means of edification as were used in the Jewish religious gatherings; and later, when the schism was complete, these means were preserved and bequeathed to succeeding generations" (p. 4).

Eusebius has preserved the catalogue of books of *Melito,* Bishop of Sardis (died after 171 A.D.) who went to the East to investigate the number and order of the books: "Five of Moses—Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; Joshua, Judges, Ruth, four of Kingdoms, two of Chronicles, Psalms of David, Proverbs of Solomon, which is also Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job; the Prophets—Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Twelve in one Book, Daniel, Ezekiel, Ezra." In this

list as in the enumeration of Josephus and Jerome, Lamentations was probably included with Jeremiah and Nehemiah with Ezra. The omission of Esther may have been due to the objections which certain Jews raised against it. If so Melito was not in harmony with the traditional view either among Jews or Christians.

Justin Martyr (died 164 A.D.) was born in Palestine and lived for a long time in Rome. He therefore had peculiar opportunities of knowing both the Jewish and Christian canon of the Old Testament. He quotes freely from the canonical books but never from the Apocrypha.

Origen (died at Tyre 254 A.D.) counted 22 canonical books and gave a list of them which also is quoted by Eusebius. It omits the Minor Prophets. This omission however cannot have been intentional for it would leave the number of books 21. It was due either to inadvertence on the part of Origen or Eusebius, or else our text of Eusebius is corrupt.

Tertullian (died about 230 A.D.) says that there are 24 canonical books of the Old Testament. This number was probably made by counting Ruth and Lamentations separately. The testimony of Christian writers in the fourth century and later is too voluminous to mention.

Thus the evidence from Jewish and Christian sources is all in favor of the canon as we have it. *Elias Levita* a Jewish Rabbi in his work Masoreth Hammasoreth, completed A.D. 1538, expressed the opinion that the final collection of the Old Testament canon was completed by Ezra and the men of the Great Synagogue. A similar view was held by David Kimchi (1160-1232). Though such a theory cannot be firmly established, there are three facts which make it possible if not probable.

(*a*) The testimony of Josephus that the canon was completed in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus in the life-time of Ezra.

(*b*) Ezra was especially concerned with the sacred books. He is called "the scribe" (Neh. 8:1, 4, 9, 13; 12: 26, 36), "a ready scribe in the law of Moses" (Ezra 7:6) and "a scribe of the words of the commandments of Jehovah, and of his statutes to Israel" (Ezra 7:11).

(*c*) The character of Ezra's time was such that the collection of the sacred books may appropriately have been made in it. After the Exile the people were founding anew the religious institutions of the nation. What could be more natural than to gather the volumes of the sacred library? There was a feeling that prophecy was about to cease (Zech. 13:2-5; Mal. 4:5). No other period of Israel's history was so appropriate for the closing of the canon.

If not by Ezra at least in his time or soon after it the Old Testament canon was closed.

VII. **The Antilegomena.** The Mishna (about 200 A.D.) speaks of strong controversies concerning the Song of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, and Esther in the second century A.D. and the Gemara alludes to objections to Ezekiel which were settled by 66 A.D. Proverbs was also under discussion among the Jews in the second century. The objection to the Song of Solomon was that it seemed to be a poem of merely human love, to Ecclesiastes that it tended toward Atheism, and to Esther that it did not mention the name of God. These three according to Wildeboer are the only Old Testament Antilegomena, for he considers the objections to Ezekiel of a less serious nature. It was that it contradicts cer-

tain requirements of the Mosaic Law. The objection to Proverbs was that certain of its maxims contradict each other.

In the first century the disciples of Hillel maintained the canonicity of Ecclesiastes while those of Shammai opposed it. The canonicity of Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon was settled by the Council of Jamnia (A.D. 90). Yet the discussion continued in the second century until the Mishna again affirmed these books canonical. Even in the third century Esther was spoken against.

These facts do not prove that the canon of the Old Testament was unsettled until 200 A.D. as the critics affirm. Buhl admits: "Such attacks upon biblical books do not exclude the idea of an earlier established canon, for indeed criticism of the several writings of the Old Testament was never altogether silenced after the Synod of Jamnia nor even after the decision given in the Mishna. Further, the very attacks referred to presuppose a Scripture Canon" (p. 26). The objections to these books were an attempt to remove them from the canon. And on the other hand, the breaking out of the discussion after the decision of the Synod and after the affirmation of the Mishna proves that the books were not canonized by the authority of Synod or Mishna. If the critical view of canonicity be correct these books are not canonical to this day. Luther thought that Esther should be excluded from the canon and I Maccabees included in it. No one on that account doubts the limits of the Protestant canon. In like manner these objections do not indicate any uncertainty in our Lord's time and later concerning the limits of the Old Testament. The books of Esther, Ecclesiastes, and the Song

of Solomon are not quoted in the New Testament simply because the New Testament writers had no occasion to quote them, as was also the case with Ezra, Nehemiah, and three of the Minor Prophets.

VIII. **The Apocrypha.** In addition to the books of the Hebrew canon the Septuagint includes the following: I Esdras, the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach or Ecclesiasticus, Judith, Tobit, Baruch, the Epistle of Jeremias, I, II, III, and IV Maccabees and certain additions to Esther, Daniel, and Psalms. These additions are said by modern critics to indicate a broader view of the canon among the Alexandrian Jews from that which obtained in Palestine. Jerome, the translator of the Vulgate, considered the Apocrypha of inferior value to the canonical books, but he was persuaded to translate Tobit and Judith and to incorporate from the Itala also Wisdom, Sirach, Baruch, I and II Maccabees and the additions to Daniel and Esther. Augustine, however, persuaded the African Church to canonize these books. At the Reformation the Protestants maintained the stricter opinion of Jerome. The Roman Catholic Church on the other hand at the Council of Trent (A.D. 1546) affirmed the equal canonical authority of all the books of the Vulgate. The Greek Church took the same course at the Council of Jerusalem (A.D. 1672). Luther included the Apocrypha in his translation but with the preface: "These are books not to be held in equal esteem with holy scripture but yet good and useful for reading." The influence of Calvin was against the Apocrypha. In England however they were not excluded from the editions of the British and Foreign Bible Society until 1825 after a sharp controversy.

There are three principal *arguments* in defense of the Apocrypha, as stated by Green (p. 181).

"1. The Apocrypha were included in the early versions of the scriptures.

"2. They were read in the churches in public worship.

"3. They were quoted by the fathers as divinely authoritative."

Concerning the first of these arguments we reply:

Of the four great ancient versions, the Syriac Peshitta did not include them and Jerome did not consider them canonical. Their inclusion in the Septuagint cannot be due to a different view of the canon from that in Palestine as is seen from three considerations.

(*a*) There is every indication of harmony between the Jews of Palestine and Egypt, which could not be the case if they differed on so vital a matter as the canon.

(*b*) Philo, an Alexandrian Jew, quotes extensively from most of the canonical books but neither quotes nor mentions any of the Apocrypha.

(*c*) Josephus in the argument against Apion, an Alexandrian grammarian, enumerates the sacred books but says nothing of the Apocrypha, as he would almost certainly have done if the view of Egyptian Jews had differed from that in Palestine on this subject.

Thus the ancient versions at most prove no higher authority for the Apocrypha than that for example which was conceded by Martin Luther. How they came into the Septuagint we do not know, though it is conceivable that it arose from their being kept in rolls on the same shelf with the sacred books.

In reply to the second argument, it is sufficient to state that the reading of the Apocrypha in public worship by no means implies their canonicity. Jerome clearly says:

"As therefore the Church reads the books of Judith, Tobit, and Maccabees but does not receive them among the canonical Scriptures, so it also reads these two volumes (Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus) for the edification of the people, but not for authority to prove the doctrines of religion." Athanasius held a similar opinion. There is no more evidence from this ancient custom for the canonicity of the Apocrypha than there is for the same view in the Church of England which appoints certain lessons from the Apocryphal books "for example of life and instruction of manners."

Concerning the quotations and references of the fathers to the Apocrypha a few considerations are important:

(*a*) A mere quotation of an Apocryphal book does not imply that it was considered canonical.

(*b*) Many of the church fathers were careless in quoting the Apocrypha by the formulas strictly belonging to sacred scripture. Such carelessness however exists even in the writings of those fathers who elsewhere declare explicitly against the Apocrypha. This inaccuracy may have been the result of the inclusion of these books in the Septuagint and Vulgate.

(*c*) Even if it be proved that certain church fathers quoted the Apocrypha as canonical we need only reply that they were in error. Sufficient evidence is cited elsewhere to show that such was not the general view of the church in ancient times.

Wildeboer mentions several reminiscences of extra-canonical books in the New Testament as evidence that the New Testament writers considered those books authoritative. He lays especial stress on seven quotations:

Matt. 27:9 "from an Apocryphal book of Jeremiah."

Luke 11:49 } "manifestly quotations though we
John 7:38 } are not able to identify the sources"
James 4:5 } (p. 53).

I Cor. 2:9 according to Origen from the Apocalypse of Elias.

Eph. 5:14 according to Epiphanius from the Apocalypse of Elias.

Jude 14-16 from the Book of Enoch.

To these Buhl adds:

Heb 11:35 founded on II Macc. 6.

II Tim. 3:8 } which he considers either from the
Heb. 11:37 } Apocrypha or oral tradition.

Answer.—(*a*) Of the seven quotations claimed by Wildeboer, not one is from a book contained in the Septuagint. The books alluded to are not considered canonical by any modern church. No argument can be derived from their use for the canonicity of the Apocrypha as found in the Septuagint or the Vulgate.

(*b*) The way the passages are quoted should be noted. If, for example, Heb. 11:35 be shown to be an allusion to II Macc. 6 it merely proves that the writer of the epistle considered II Macc. a truthful historical record —not that he considered it canonical. If Paul quoted certain Greek authors with approval without affirming their divine authority, these references to the Pseudepigrapha give no evidence that the books were canonical. Reuss admits: "In all the New Testament no one has been able to point out a single dogmatic passage taken from the Apocrypha and quoted as proceeding from a sacred authority" (pp. 8-9). In this conclusion Ryle concurs (p. 154).

(*c*) The passages alluded to are not quotations. At the most they are only bare allusions to certain books

current at that time. Some of these allusions may have been to oral traditions or the well-known facts of Israel's history rather than to any Apocryphal record of that history.

IX. **The Three-fold Division of the Canon.** Several theories have been advanced to account for the arrangement of the books of the Hebrew scriptures.

1. The current critical view is that the three divisions indicate three stages of collection and canonization.

Answer.—This view does not account for the facts. As will be shown under Special Introduction, several books of the third division (Job, Proverbs, Song of Solomon, Ruth, and many Psalms) are older than several books in the second division (Kings, Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi). Indeed according to Jewish tradition inspiration ceased with Malachi. The second division of the canon must therefore have remained open till nearly all of the books of the third division were in existence and hence canonical. Furthermore this theory does not account for the names of the second and third divisions. On what principle was the third division begun? Why were not the books of the third division admitted into the second instead of being placed by themselves? For this the critics give no satisfactory explanation.

2. The Jewish theologians assert that the three divisions of the canon correspond to three degrees of inspiration. The highest form of inspiration was that of Moses who spoke directly with God; the second that of the prophets who wrote by the spirit of prophecy; and the lowest that of the other writers who were inspired by the Holy Spirit.

Answer.—Such a distinction as this has no warrant

in the scriptures themselves. The prophets possessed equal authority with Moses and the other writers with the prophets. The distinction between the spirit of prophecy and the Holy Spirit is purely imaginary.

3. Certain conservative writers distinguish the prophetic gift and the prophetic office. The books of those who held the prophetic office were placed in the second division, while the writings of those who had the gift of prophecy but were not officially prophets were placed in the third division. This theory is the most satisfactory.

A. It agrees with the true view concerning the test of canonicity. The Old Testament books were immediately recognized as divinely authoritative, because their authors were known as the official representatives of God among His people. This fact made it important to separate the writings of the prophets from the works of those men who were inspired but were not prophets.

B. It accounts for the classification of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings as the "Former Prophets." These books cannot have been called Prophets from their internal character. Buhl thinks that they were put in the second division because they contained occasional utterances of the prophets. Such a principle however would have brought in Chronicles. The principle of arrangement was evidently not in the contents of the books but in the official status of their authors.

C. It also accounts for the separation of Daniel from Ezekiel, his contemporary prophet, and the separation of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah from Samuel and Kings, the other historical books. The books of Moses, the founder of the theocracy, were placed by themselves, then those of his successors, the prophets, and finally

those of other inspired men not prophets. Some of these were kings like David and Solomon, others priests like Ezra, and others were possessed of the spirit of prophecy like Daniel.

Three serious objections are offered to this view.

A. Lamentations is found among the Kethubhim although it is considered the work of the prophet, Jeremiah.

Answer.—It can be shown from the testimony of Origen, Jerome, and probably Josephus that Lamentations and Ruth were often placed and counted with Jeremiah and Judges. When so counted the number of books was 22, the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet. When Ruth and Lamentations were counted separately the number was 24, the number of letters in the Greek alphabet. The arrangement according to the Hebrew alphabet was probably the older. Hence the original position of Ruth and Lamentations was among the Prophets because their authors held the prophetic office. Later they were placed with the other three short books which were also read in the synagogue on certain feast and fast days. These five Megilloth were arranged in the Hebrew Bibles in the order of the days on which they were read in the synagogues: the Song of Solomon at the Passover, Ruth at Pentecost, Lamentations at the fast on the ninth of Ab, Ecclesiastes at the Feast of Tabernacles, and Esther at Purim.

B. A greater difficulty is that of Daniel which is found in the third division, although Daniel was a prophet (Matt. 24:15; Mark 13:14).

Answer.—Although Daniel possessed the spirit of prophecy to a marked degree, his office and his work were altogether exceptional. He was not among the

exiles like Ezekiel but at the court of Babylon, and he had to do with heathen kings rather than with the people of Israel. In the New Testament, like David, (Acts 2:29-30) he is called a prophet because of his predictions.

C. The words of Amos 7:14 ("I was no prophet neither was I a prophet's son") are said to overthrow the distinction between the prophetic gift and the prophetic office. It is said that according to our principle Amos should be among the Kethubhim on his own word.

Answer.—A careful reading of the context will show that Amos does not deny his prophetic office. He is speaking of what he was before God called him to be a prophet; for immediately after this statement he says, "The Lord took me as I followed the flock and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people, Israel" (Amos 7:15). This was his commission as a prophet, a commission which was never given to Daniel.

II

THE TEXT

I. **Languages of the Old Testament.** The Old Testament was written in the Hebrew language with the exception of portions of Daniel (2:4—7:28) and Ezra (4:8—6:19; 7:12—27) and a verse in Jeremiah (10:11) which are Aramaic. There are also certain Aramaic words in Gen. 31:47 and possibly elsewhere, though many words and forms commonly considered Aramaic may have been rare or archaic Hebrew.

II. **The Semitic Languages.** The family of languages to which Hebrew and Aramaic belong is called Semitic for convenience although on the one hand they were not spoken by all Semitic people (Persia, Gen. 10:22), and on the other they were spoken by some non-Semites (Phenicians, Gen. 10:15). Zimmern classifies these languages as follows:

1. Babylonian-Assyrian, represented by cuneiform documents from at least the fourth to the first millennium before Christ.

2. Aramaic.

Ancient Aramaic inscriptions.

A. West Aramaic.

(1) Biblical Aramaic (Jewish Aramaic). [The Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra is better classified as East Aramaic.]

(2) Palmyrene Inscriptions.

(3) Nabatean Inscriptions.
(4) Jewish-Palestinian Aramaic.
(*a*) Jewish-Aramaic (Targum Onkelos, Targum Jonathan).
(*b*) Galilean-Aramaic (Jerusalem Talmud, Jerusalem Targums and Midrash).
(5) Christian-Palestinian Aramaic (Galilean-Aramaic).
(6) Samaritan.
(7) The modern Aramaic dialect of Ma'lula in the Lebanon.

B. East Aramaic.
(1) Babylonian Aramaic (Babylonian Talmud).
(2) Mandæan.
(3) Syrian (of Edessa).
(4) The modern Aramaic dialects in Tur 'Abdin, in Assyria, in Kurdistan, and on Lake Urmiah.

3. Canaanite.
(1) Canaanite glosses of the Tel-el-Amarna letters.
(2) Phœnician (and modern Punic).
(3) Hebrew.
(*a*) Biblical Hebrew.
(*b*) Post-Biblical Hebrew.
(4) Moabite. (The Mesa Inscription).

4. Arabic.
A. North Arabic.
(1) North Arabic inscriptions of different kinds.
(2) Classic ancient Arabic.
(3) Modern Arabic dialects. The Arabic of Syria, Egypt, Tunis, Malta, and Oman.

B. South Arabic.
(1) Minæan and Sabæan inscriptions.
(2) Modern South-Arabian dialects (Mehri).
5. Ethiopic.
(1) Ancient Ethiopic inscriptions.
(2) Ethiopic (Geez).
(3) Modern Ethiopic dialects.
(*a*) Tigre, Tigrina.
(*b*) Amharic.
(Vergleichende Grammatik, pp. 1-3.)

These five groups are by some reduced to two by designating Arabic and Ethiopic as South-Semitic in contrast to the others as North-Semitic. It was formerly customary to divide them into the East-Semitic (Babylonian-Assyrian) and the West-Semitic.

The Semitic languages are all derived from *a single parent language* which disappeared in prehistoric times. They are much more closely related to each other than are the Indo-European languages, having many things in common both in vocabulary and grammatical structure. Though the original Semitic may have come from a common source with the Indo-European languages, the Semitic languages now possess scarcely anything in common with the Indo-European. There is however a close affinity between the Semitic languages and the Egyptian and other Hamitic tongues of Northeastern Africa. This is specially seen in the personal pronouns, the numerals, and in the formation of the verb.

Concerning the *original home* of the Semitic languages, there is a wide difference of opinion. Von

Kremer, Guidi, and Hommel by a careful study of the words which the Semitic languages have in common, and of those in which they differ, and which therefore each language must have obtained after separation from the parent stock, conclude that the original Semites migrated to Babylonia from the regions south and southwest of the Caspian Sea. The more probable theory is that of Wright, Sayce, Schrader, and others, that the Semites came into Babylonia from the south, viz., from the Arabian peninsula—a view which is supported by Semitic tradition. It is also confirmatory of this theory, that though the youngest of the Semitic languages, Arabic exhibits the least evidence of decay and preserves the original grammatical structure more nearly than any other Semitic language. All this agrees admirably with Schrader's conception of the migration of the primitive Semites from Arabia, as outlined by William Wright: "He imagines the northern Semites—*i. e.*, the Aramæans, Babylonians, and Canaanites—to have parted in a body from their brethren in the south, and to have settled in Babylonia, where they lived together for a long period. The Aramæans would be the first to separate from the main body of emigrants; at a considerably later period, the Canaanites; last of all the Assyrians. At the same time an emigration would be going on in a southerly direction. Leaving the northern Arabs in Central Arabia, these emigrants would settle on the southern coast of the peninsula whence a band of them subsequently crossed the sea into Africa and pitched in Abyssinia" (Comparative Semitic Grammar, p. 9). A third theory has been advanced by Nöldeke who argues from the resemblance with the Hamitic lan-

guages that the home of the Semites may have been in Africa (Sem. Sprache p. 11).

There are several *peculiarities* of the Semitic languages in which they differ radically from the Indo-European:

1. The Semitic alphabet consists exclusively of consonants, the vowels not being essential to the roots of the words.

2. Words in their various forms and inflections are made chiefly by internal changes rather than by external additions to the root. These internal changes are of two kinds, the introduction of certain vowels, and the doubling of certain consonants.

3. Roots consist almost invariably of three letters.

4. The Semitic languages lack the exactness of expression peculiar to the Indo-European, but on the other hand they far excel all other languages in vividness. They are weak in those connectives and particles which give precision to language but very rich in words and forms which indicate intensity and plurality or which contain metaphors. They are concrete rather than abstract and pictorial rather than logical. They express the ruling element in the Semitic character which was emotional rather than intellectual.

5. Finally the Semitic languages exhibit far less tendency to change than the Indo-European. This also corresponds to the Semitic character which has kept the Orient unchangeable in customs and dress for thousands of years. Even where these languages have come in contact with other languages through immigration, commerce and conquest, they have resisted strongly the tendency to change.

It has often been pointed out that on account of the

last two of these peculiarities a Semitic language was best adapted to be the medium of the early revelation to mankind, since that revelation so largely took the symbolic, pictorial form, and the preservation of the contents of revelation unchanged was of the utmost importance. When however revelation took the abstract form and symbol gave place to reality, the New Testament was given in the most exact of all languages, the Greek.

A brief statement of the *history* of these languages must suffice.

1. The *Assyrian,* or as some prefer to name it the Babylonian, is the most ancient Semitic language in the remains which we now possess. Through excavations during the last half century we have a very large number of documents in this language extending from 4000 B.C. or even earlier to about 500 B.C. when the Assyrian yielded to the Persian. These remains include rock inscriptions, royal histories inscribed on large clay tablets, astronomical reports, the code of Hammurabi, hymns, syllabaries, inscribed boundary stones and a great mass of commercial contracts and letters upon small clay tablets often inclosed in a clay envelope. Though many of these antedate 1000 B.C. the great majority belong to the five centuries succeeding that time. As early as 1400 B.C. Assyrian was the political language of western Asia and in it the governors of Syria made their reports to their Egyptian master, as preserved in the Tel-el-Amarna letters.

Although the Assyrian is the oldest known Semitic tongue, even in its earliest form it shows evidence of having undergone a long development. Doubtless this is partly due to the influence of the ancient non-Semitic

Sumerian language which it replaced. The old perfect of the verb is almost lost as is also the distinction between the guttural letters. Therefore although Assyrian is not of great value grammatically in the study of Semitic and especially of Hebrew, and we cannot agree with those enthusiastic Assyriologists who consider it the Sanskrit of the Semitic languages, we may expect from its vocabulary increasing light upon the hapax legomena of the Old Testament and from the contents of its literature increasing confirmation of Old Testament history. The language of the ancestors of Abraham, of the nation whose civilization overran Palestine in the century before the Exodus, and which finally conquered both the Northern and the Southern kingdoms is of great importance to the study of the Old Testament.

2. The original home of the *Aramaic* language was probably on the southern part of the Tigris. From there it gradually spread over all the western portion of the great Assyrian empire. The name of the country where this language was spoken is אֲרָם or Syria. Aramaic was the language of Padan-Aram where Laban lived and of the kingdom of Damascus which had such frequent intercourse with Israel and Judah. It was the popular tongue of a large part of the later Babylonian empire and was known to Daniel and Ezra. In the Persian period its influence spread over Syria and Palestine and reached even to Asia Minor, Arabia, and Egypt. The Jews did not however change their own language for Aramaic during the Exile, as was formerly supposed, and the name Chaldee for the language of Daniel and Ezra is altogether erroneous. The Jews found Aramaic in Palestine upon their return and

there it gradually replaced the Hebrew. Aside from numerous inscriptions in the countries already mentioned, the chief monument of Eastern Aramaic is found in the portions of Daniel and Ezra. These are quite near to the Hebrew. The later Western Aramaic of the Targums and Talmud however differs widely from this earlier form.

Since the Jews used the term Aramæan as a designation for heathen, that name was rejected by the Syrian Christians. In its place they called their language by the Greek name Syrian or Syriac, a name which was originally identical with Assyrian but later was confined by the Greeks to the western portion of the Assyrian empire. The Syrian Christians also adopted different letters from the Jewish, probably from an Arabic source, and in this language we have the ancient Syriac version of the scriptures called the Peshitta. The Samaritan language was also a dialect of Aramaic and it is spoken to-day in various forms in isolated places of the East. Aramaic was the language of Palestine in the time of Christ and probably of our Lord himself.

3. The third group includes the languages of ancient Canaan and especially *Hebrew*. Of all the Canaanite nations and indeed of all people speaking Semitic languages the Phenicians were the greatest traders. Their ships went the entire length of the Mediterranean and even to Britain and they made colonies in Cyprus, Sicily northern Africa, and Spain. The oldest known inscriptions in Phenician, which is very similar to Hebrew, date from the eighth century before Christ. Many later ones have been found, especially in the neighborhood of Tyre and Sidon and of ancient Carthage.

A. The name Hebrew is variously explained. It is used in the Old Testament of the people and never of their language. By some it is derived from עֵבֶר "beyond," hence the people who came from beyond the river Euphrates. Therefore Abram is called the Hebrew (Gen. 14:13). Others trace it to Eber the father of Peleg (Gen 11:14). Whatever its derivation the term Hebrew was used broadly of all Semites (Gen. 10:21) and of a people beyond the Euphrates (Num. 24:24). In later times it was the national name of the chosen people as Israel was their covenant name. This distinction gave place to that of Israel and Judah from the schism of Jeroboam and onward. The language is called the language of Canaan (Isa. 19:18) and the Jews' language (Isa. 36:11) in the Old Testament but Hebrew in the prologue to Ecclesiasticus. Aramaic is called Hebrew in the New Testament as the language of the Hebrew people (Jno. 5:2; Acts 21:40; 22:2, and probably Jno. 19:20).

B. Remains of Hebrew. The Old Testament is almost the only classic Hebrew in existence. The language of the Moabite stone is indeed so similar to Hebrew that it is classed as such by Roediger and later by Kautzsch in their editions of Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. This inscription of thirty-four lines, discovered in 1868 by a German missionary, F. A. Klein, at Dibon, east of the Dead Sea, is now preserved in the Louvre. Mesa, king of Moab (about 900 B.C.), records hereon his battles with Israel and his buildings (II Kings 3:4-5). Others designate this language Moabite. Another fragment of ancient Hebrew is the inscription of six lines found in 1880 in the tunnel between the Pool of Siloam and the Virgin's Spring in Jerusa-

lem. This belongs to the eighth century B.C. (II Kings 20:20). Besides these there are certain seals engraved with proper names, some of them pre-exilic, and a number of coins of John Hyrcanus (135 B.C.). The Mishna (200 A.D.) and many books of later times were written by Jewish scholars in imitation of the Old Testament language, but such works should no more be classed with Hebrew literature than modern theological works in Latin with Latin literature.

C. History of Hebrew. The origin of the Hebrew language is involved in obscurity. Its similarity to the language of the tribes which Israel conquered as evidenced by the Canaanite glosses in the Tel-el-Amarna letters, argues that Hebrew must have been the language of the patriarchs before their descent into Egypt. On the other hand, the fact that their kinsman Laban spoke not Hebrew but Aramaic (Gen. 31:47) and that Jacob is called an Aramæan (Deut. 26:5) argues that Abraham did not bring the Hebrew language with him from Haran. The most probable explanation is that Abraham found this language in Canaan. Since it was so similar to Aramaic it was easily adopted by the three generations of patriarchs who lived in Canaan. That it was preserved during the four centuries in Egypt is explained by the isolation of Israel in that land and the probability that they remained in intercourse with the inhabitants of southern Palestine.

From the time of Moses the history of the Hebrew language can be traced in the Old Testament itself. There is not sufficient evidence for the conclusion that there were different dialects of Hebrew in different parts of Palestine, though the pronunciation of an Ephraimite differed in some respects from that in Gilead (Judges

12:6) just as in New Testament times a Galilean could be distinguished by his speech (Matt. 26:73; Luke 22:59). There is however in Hebrew as in other languages a sharp distinction between the language of prose and that of poetry, the latter retaining many unusual words, forms and constructions which had become obsolete in prose.

The history of the language falls into two periods, the dividing line being shortly before the Exile. The books written before this time show comparatively little change while those written later exhibit a rapid deterioration from the purity of the older language. This has been well described by Green: "In the writings of Jeremiah and Zephaniah, there is a manifest decline. The books of Daniel, Esther, Ezra and Nehemiah form a striking contrast in point of purity of language with the historical books written at an earlier date. The books of Chronicles possess the characteristics of the later Hebrew to a greater extent than the Kings, for though the latter were written during the Exile, they preserve more exactly the language of the older writings upon which they are throughout based. Ezekiel presents the greatest number of anomalies and foreign forms. He lived and labored amongst the exiles and probably reflects more exactly than any other writer the actual deterioration which had taken place in the language of common intercourse. The transition which was going forward is also shown in the fact that Daniel and Ezra are written partly in Hebrew and partly in Aramæan. It is remarkable that in the prophets subsequent to the exile, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, the language is less infected with Aramæisms and exhibits a marked return toward the purity and correct-

ness of former times. This is doubtless due to their study and imitation of earlier writers and not to any improvement of the language as popularly spoken" (General Introduction. The Text, pp. 21-22).

There is a difference of opinion concerning the date when Hebrew ceased to be a spoken language, some contending that it was replaced by Aramaic during the Exile and others that it remained in use more or less till the second century B.C. Both these views are extreme. The first is opposed by the fact that the post-Exilic prophets used Hebrew as the language of the people, and the other by the Aramæisms of the Exilic prophets and the Aramaic portions of Ezra and Daniel.

We know that Aramaic was known to Jewish courtiers in the days of Hezekiah 701 B.C. (II Kings 18:26). But the process of change from Hebrew to Aramaic must have been a slow one, beginning before the Exile and continuing a century or more after it. Yet many must have understood Aramaic before Hebrew ceased to be spoken, as is shown by the fact that the authors of Ezra and Daniel wrote in both languages.

D. Hebrew Letters. The present square characters of our Hebrew printed Bibles were not the original ones. The Siloam inscription and the Maccabean coins were written in another form which is very similar to that which has been preserved in the Samaritan Pentateuch. According to the best authorities these older letters were derived from the Phenicians. It is impossible to determine accurately when they gave place to the square letters. The reference of our Lord to *yodh* as the smallest letter of the alphabet seems to indicate that the same letters were in use in his time

as in ours (Matt. 5:18). Probably their introduction was a gradual process completed not later than a century before Christ.

E. Vowel Points and Accents. The vowel points and accents are also a later addition in Hebrew as in Arabic and Syriac. The variation of the Septuagint and Origen's Hexapla in the transliteration of proper names shows that they did not possess the vowel points. Synagogue manuscripts never have them. The earliest trace of their existence is in a manuscript of the Latter Prophets dated 916 A.D. discovered by Firkowitsch in 1839. On the other hand the Talmud which was completed in the fifth century gives no evidence of their existence. Doubtless the vowel points and accents were introduced by the Massorites not earlier than the sixth century, in order to perpetuate the ancient tradition concerning the meaning and pronunciation of the sacred text.

F. The Study of Hebrew. Since the completion of the Old Testament canon the Hebrew language has been the subject of study, first among Jews and then among Christians. The scribes, who were the successors of Ezra, busied themselves with the sacred text. After the destruction of Jerusalem, schools for the study of the sacred language were established in the east and flourished there nearly a thousand years. Their students are called the Massorites or students of the Massorah, tradition. From them came the Targums, the Talmud, the system of vowel points and accents, and the *keri* notes. About 1000 A.D. the Jewish schools in Spain began to be prominent, especially at Grenada, Toledo and Barcelona. These scholars studied the grammar and lexicon of the language scientifically and

many of the grammatical terms in modern use came from them. The most famous grammarians of this period were David Kimchi of Narbonne, France (1160-1232 A.D.) and Elias Levita who died at Venice in 1549.

Among Christians there was a prejudice against the study of Hebrew in the post-Apostolic age. Origen in the east and Jerome in the west are the only church fathers who pursued it. The same ignorance of the language continued until the Reformation, when with the revival of learning, a new interest in this study arose, under Jewish teaching. The most eminent of these Reformation scholars was John Reuchlin, whose grammar appeared in 1506. All the Reformers however were acquainted with Hebrew, but for more than a century after the Reformation the Christian study of Hebrew followed Jewish methods and accepted Jewish results. Johann Buxtorf (1564-1629), Professor at Basel, and his son of the same name (1599-1664) added much to the knowledge of Hebrew, the former producing a Hebrew grammar and lexicon as well as a Rabbinic Bible. Albert Schultens (1686-1750), Professor at Leyden, was the first to make use of Arabic extensively in the study of Hebrew. He with N. W. Schröder (died 1798) were the leaders of the Dutch school. In the nineteenth century the language has been studied more scientifically than ever before. Of the many Hebraists of modern times the most important are William Gesenius (1786-1842) of Halle whose lexicon and grammar have gone through many editions to the present time, G. H. A. Ewald (1803-1875) of Göttingen who attempted a rational explanation of the phenomena of the language and Justus Olshausen (1800-1882) of

Berlin who traced Hebrew words and forms to primitive Semitic as perpetuated in Arabic.

4. *Arabic.* This branch of the Semitic family of languages is divided into the North and South Arabic.

A. North Arabic was the language whose original home was in the northern and central portion of that vast peninsula. Though the peoples of northern Arabia are known to have engaged in wars with Assyria, Persia and Rome, we have as yet no knowledge of the language in those ancient times, except a few inscriptions perhaps of the time of the Ptolemies. The Arabs who lived in the ancient Nabathean Kingdom east of the Dead Sea (Isa. 60:7) shortly before and after Christ, spoke Aramaic. Yet their native language often shows itself through the adopted tongue. And their Arabic was evidently very similar to the classic language. In the sixth century of our era the Arabic was essentially the same throughout all the Northern portion of the peninsula. From this period come a large number of poetic rhapsodies in the purest form of the language. The military conquests of Mohammed and his fanatical followers within a hundred years carried the standard of the prophet as far east as India and westward through all northern Africa and into Spain. The Koran was written in Koraish, the language of the tribe to which the prophet belonged. Its style is in imitation of the poets of the previous century. This became the sacred classic language for the entire Mohammedan world. It fixed the language in a stereotyped form from which there has been very slight variation even to the present day. It is true that considerable variety exists in pronunciation, for example between Egypt and Syria, and the common people carelessly drop the vowel sounds

at the end of words. Nevertheless the written language to-day is everywhere practically identical with that of the prophet. It is spoken in its purest form by the Bedouin of the desert and is most corrupted in Malta, in which island is found the only dialect of Arabic spoken exclusively by Christians.

Concerning the extent of Arabic literature, the greatest of modern Arabic scholars, William Wright, has said: "There are few, if any, nations of ancient and medieval Europe which can boast of a literature like the Arabic, especially in history, geography, philosophy, and other sciences, to say nothing of poetry, and of the peculiar systems of theology and law which depend upon the Koran and the Sunnah" (Comparative Semitic Grammar, p. 27). The Arabic is distinguished among the Semitic languages not only for its extensive literature but the great wealth of its vocabulary and the remarkable simplicity and richness of its grammatical structure. On these accounts it is of more value than any other language to the student of Hebrew.

B. South Arabic was the language of the ancient kingdom of Saba or Sheba, mentioned in the Old Testament (I Kings 10:1; Job 1:15; Joel 3:8) on the southern coast of Arabia. It is also called Himyaritic and includes the ancient language of the provinces of Yemen, Hadramaut (Gen. 10:26) and Mahrah. It is known to us in its pure form only from inscriptions whose dates are probably from the second century before to the fifth century after Christ. In Yemen this language yielded early to Northern Arabic, but the eastern provinces retained their language longer, and the modern dialects of southeastern Arabia as far as the island of Sokotra differ considerably from pure Arabic.

5. *Ethiopic* was the language of Abyssinia, an ancient Himyaritic colony, and it is classed by many in the same group with Arabic. Its ancient name was Geez. The oldest remains of it are royal inscriptions which date from 350-500 A.D. Nöldeke thinks that the first missionaries to Abyssinia must have spoken Aramaic. Thus he accounts for the traces of Aramaic especially in the religious vocabulary of Geez. The translation of the Bible into Ethiopic belongs to the fourth and fifth centuries. From this time until about 1000 A.D. it continued to be the language of the people, but after this time it was cultivated only by the priests and as the language of the schools. The modern representatives of Ethiopic in the order of their nearness to the mother-tongue are the three dialects of Tigre, Tigrina, and Amharic. Apart from Arabic the last-named dialect is spoken by more people than any other Semitic language, its territory extending far to the south. Many of those speaking it however are not Semites and well-nigh half its vocabulary is derived from non-Semitic languages. Its literature is confined to a few songs of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and books of European missionaries in the nineteenth century.

III. **Hebrew Manuscripts.** The manuscripts of the Old Testament are of two kinds, synagogue rolls and private manuscripts. The former were used for reading in the public worship. They accordingly included only those parts read in the synagogue, viz., the Pentateuch, selections from the Prophets and the five Megilloth. The Law was commonly in a roll by itself, then the Haphtaroth or selections from the Prophets and the five small books in as many small rolls. According to

the Talmud the utmost care was taken in the preparation of these rolls, the rules governing the kind of parchment and ink, the formation of the letters and columns, and the correction of the manuscript. If four errors were found on one page of a manuscript it was rejected. When these manuscripts became old they were placed in the Geniza, or lumber-room of the synagogue. Not many of them have come into Christian hands.

Private manuscripts were also prepared with great care and many of them are beautifully adorned with handsome initial letters and marginal pictures. They are often accompanied by marginal additions such as the Massora, a Targum or Arabic version, or a Rabbinic commentary. Sometimes they are upon rolls but more often in book form and rarely is the entire Old Testament contained in a single volume.

The determination of the age of Hebrew manuscripts is a very difficult matter. Often they are undated and one must depend entirely upon the known antiquity of some marginal doxology or other formula. The dates attached to many manuscripts are difficult to interpret, for they count from different eras and often the thousands and even the hundreds are omitted. Furthermore dates are sometimes added to them or existing dates altered, in order to increase their value. There are also many extravagant stories concerning the age of some manuscripts. The known manuscripts of the Old Testament are not nearly so numerous as those of the New Testament. Nor are they so old as the Greek manuscripts or even the manuscripts of some Old Testament versions. The oldest dated manuscript is the St. Petersburg Codex of A.D. 916 which contains

the Latter Prophets. A facsimile of this codex has been edited by Professor Strack (St. Petersburg 1876). Ginsburg however considers the manuscript in the British Museum, known as Oriental 4445 to date from A.D. 820-850. This contains 186 folios of which 55 were lost and replaced, according to a note, in A.D. 1540. The Codex of Moses ben Asher from about 890-895 A.D. is said to be kept by the Karaite Jews in Cairo and that of his son Aaron ben Asher is said to be in the possession of the Jews in Aleppo. The former of these contains only the Prophets, the latter the entire canon. The oldest manuscript of the entire Old Testament is one of the Firkowitsch collection dated A.D. 1010. An examination of several hundred manuscripts has resulted in finding no important variations—far fewer than are found in New Testament codices.

The *Samaritan Pentateuch* should also be classed among Hebrew codices, since it is not a translation of the Pentateuch into the Samaritan language, but the Hebrew original written in Samaritan letters. The first copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch to reach Europe was brought thither from the Samaritan community in Damascus by the Italian traveler Peter della Valle in 1616 A.D. It was published in the Paris Polyglott (1645) and the London Polyglott (1657). The copy preserved in the synagogue at Nablus is said to have been written by Abishua, the great-grandson of Aaron. The oldest known manuscript of the Samaritan Pentateuch is in the New York Public Library. Its date is 1232 A.D.

There has been much discussion concerning the origin and reliability of the Samaritan Pentateuch. These questions depend largely upon the origin of the Samari-

tans themselves. They are not descendants of Israelites of the northern kingdom but of the colonists whom the king of Assyria sent to Samaria after its capture and the exile of its inhabitants (II Kings 17:24-25). These colonists adopted the worship of Jehovah (II Kings 17:25-29) and when the exiles returned to Jerusalem, the Samaritans offered to assist them in rebuilding the temple (Ezra 4:1-2). This being refused they set up a rival temple on Mount Gerizim, which they now affirm was built in Joshua's day. In the seventeenth century they had small communities in Cairo, Gaza, and Damascus but now there remain only three hundred of them at Nablus. They have always hated the Jews and yet claimed descent from them. The old view that their Pentateuch comes from that which existed in the northern kingdom before Sargon captured Samaria, is now generally abandoned. We know however that the Pentateuch existed in the kingdom of Israel from the pre-exilic prophets of that kingdom (Hosea and Amos) and it is difficult to understand how the Samaritans were taught the religion of the land without receiving its sacred books (II Kings 17:28). The commonly accepted theory of the origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch is based upon an incident mentioned by Josephus —that Manasses, brother of the high-priest at Jerusalem, married the daughter of Sanballat, governor of Samaria, and being excommunicated, fled to Samaria and set up the rival worship at Mt. Gerizim. This statement of Josephus probably rests upon Neh. 13:28. It is supposed that this Manasses took the Pentateuch with him to Samaria. If this theory be the true one, the rejection of the later books by the Samaritans is due to the fact that those books sanction the worship

at Shiloh and Jerusalem. In order to substantiate the false claims of Mt. Gerizim the Samaritans also altered the text of the Pentateuch.

The Samaritan Pentateuch varies in many passages from the Massoretic text and a careful examination has revealed the fact that many of these readings agree with the Septuagint against the Hebrew. From this some have concluded that the Septuagint was made from a Samaritan codex and others that both were derived from a common source which differed radically from the Massoretic text. The large number of divergences from the Septuagint makes these views untenable. Probably the Samaritan codex was altered to conform to the Septuagint in order to strengthen its claims, when the Septuagint was held in high esteem. Formerly scholars were disposed to extol the Samaritan text as representing the most ancient tradition. Since it has been found to be comparatively modern and that the manuscripts differ between themselves much more than Hebrew manuscripts, the old view has changed. Buhl expresses a conservative conclusion: "The Samaritan text has been so disfigured by errors of transcription and by arbitrary treatment, that its critical importance is very much restricted" (p. 89).

There is a version of the Samaritan Pentateuch in the Samaritan language dating from about the second century A.D. and an Arabic version from the eleventh or twelfth century.

IV. **Divisions of the Hebrew Text.** These are of four kinds.

1. *Verses.* These are of Jewish origin and antedate the Talmud. The Jews marked the end of the verse by placing a perpendicular line called *Silluk* under the

last word and two dots called *Soph Pasuk* ("end of the verse") in a perpendicular position after it. The numbering of the verses was adopted from Robert Stephen's edition of the Vulgate (1555 A.D.).

2. *Paragraphs or Parashas.* These are also ancient. They are of two kinds—open and closed. Open paragraphs are those in which there is a change of thought. In manuscripts the remainder of the line before an open paragraph is left open. If this space equals that of three triliteral words the open parasha begins at the extreme right of the next line, but if not another entire line is left vacant. A closed parasha indicates a slighter change of thought and may begin on the same line with the end of the previous parasha. These rules are generally ignored in printed editions. In some manuscripts and most printed Hebrew Bibles open paragraphs are marked by a פ (פְּתוּחָה = open) in the space at the beginning and closed paragraphs by a ס (סְתוּמָה = closed). This custom however is of later origin.

3. *Synagogue Lessons.* These are of two systems. According to the Palestinian custom the Pentateuch was read through on the Sabbath once in three years. Accordingly it was divided into 154 to 167 sections called Sedarim (סְדָרִים). These are ignored in most manuscripts and printed editions, since the Babylonian method prevailed over that in Palestine. According to the Babylonian system there are 54 sections in the Pentateuch called Perashiyoth (פָּרָשִׁיּוֹת) allowing for reading the entire law in one year. In many manuscripts and printed copies these Perashiyoth are indicated by a thrice repeated פ if their beginning coincides with the beginning of an open paragraph, and by a thrice repeated ס if it coincides with the beginning of a closed

paragraph. Perashiyoth are named like the books of the Pentateuch from their opening words. Certain sections of the prophets called Haphtaroth ("dismissals") were read after the reading of the law on the Sabbath. They are not, however, indicated in the text but at the close of our printed editions is a table stating what haphtara should be read after each parasha.

4. *Chapters.* This division is of Christian origin, having been used first in the Vulgate in the thirteenth century. Rabbi Solomon ben Ishmael (about 1330 A.D.) numbered the chapters according to the Christian mode to facilitate reference, but it was not until much later that this division was generally adopted. It is found in the Bomberg Bible of 1517.

V. **Versions.** There are four ancient versions of the Old Testament which were made directly from the Hebrew: the Greek Septuagint, the Aramaic Targums, the Syriac Peshitta, and the Latin Vulgate, of which the last two include also the New Testament.

1. The *Septuagint,* also called the Alexandrian version, from the city of its origin, is not only the oldest known translation of the Jewish scriptures but the oldest known translation of any book. The exact time of the Septuagint is unknown. It is fixed, however, between two dates. The prologue of the book of Ecclesiasticus (130 B.C.) alludes to "the law, the prophets and the rest of the books" as already translated into Greek. This date is, therefore, the latest to which this version can be brought. On the other hand the letter of Aristeas, which Buhl dates earlier than 198 B.C., gives an account of the origin of the Septuagint. This Aristeas is said to have been an officer of Ptolemy II, Philadelphus (B.C. 284-247) and the letter was written

to his brother Philocrates. The story is as follows: Demetrius Phalereus persuaded the king to have the Jewish Law translated into Greek. The king sent Aristeas with a guard to Eleazar the High Priest at Jerusalem to request a copy of the Law and competent translators. The High Priest sent seventy-two men, six from each tribe, and a copy of the Law written in golden letters. Ptolemy sent the men to the island of Pharos where they finished the translation in seventy-two days.

According to Philo these translators were inspired, and certain church fathers as well as the Talmud affirm that, though made independently, their translations were found to be exactly alike. This story is not worthy of credence. It serves however to show that the Pentateuch was translated into Greek in Alexandria about 250 B.C. The varying excellence of the translation in other books indicates that they were not all done by the same men nor at the same time. The Pentateuch, Former Prophets, and Psalms are well rendered, but the translation of the other books is either slavishly literal, as in Ecclesiastes, or very free, as in Daniel and elsewhere. The most natural conclusion is that the Septuagint was a gradual work occupying the century from 250 to 150 B.C. Considering the times the work was remarkably well done, but it is not in every part a translation in the modern sense. No sharp distinction was made in those days between the work of translation and that of interpretation. Thus the Septuagint is in some places a translation, in others a paraphrase, and in others a running commentary. It bears many evidences of its Jewish origin, but none, as some have affirmed, of the influence of Greek philosophy.

The Septuagint at first was welcomed by the Jews. There is not, however, sufficient ground for the assertion that it was used in the synagogues of Palestine. Nevertheless Josephus used it extensively, and we know from the New Testament that it must have been familiar to many other Palestinian Jews. In later times when controversies arose between the Jews and the Christians, the latter referred to the Septuagint and the former to the original Hebrew. Thus the Jewish view concerning the Septuagint gradually changed to one of bitter dislike. They affirmed that the Christians altered the Greek text to support their views and the same contention was made by the Christians, that the Jews altered the Hebrew original.

The text of the Septuagint soon became corrupt and in the time of Origen (254 A.D.) there were, according to his testimony, almost as many readings as there were manuscripts. Accordingly that great scholar attempted in his Hexapla to restore the original Greek and to show its relation to the Hebrew. He placed the Septuagint in parallel columns with the Hebrew. Origen however did not succeed in unifying the Alexandrian text. He marked the passages where the Septuagint differed from the Hebrew and even added within marks words wanting in the Greek. Later revisions of the Septuagint were made by Lucian of Samosata, the founder of the Antiochian school (martyred 311 A.D.), and Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop (also martyred 311 A.D.). These various recensions themselves became corrupted. The result was greater and greater confusion which has only been partly cleared up in modern times. The first printed edition of the Septuagint was that in the Complutensian Polyglott (1514-1517 A.D.). This was fol-

lowed by that of Aldus Manutius in 1518 A.D. The principal manuscripts of the Septuagint are the Codex Vaticanus, in Rome, the Codex Alexandrinus in the British Museum, and the Codex Sinaiticus in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg, all of which have been published in facsimile. The best recent printed edition is that of H. B. Swete which largely follows the Codex Vaticanus.

Many ancient versions were made from the Septuagint, the most important of which were the Latin Itala made in North Africa in the second century A.D., the Syro-Hexaplaric made in Alexandria, 617-618 A.D., the Gothic by Bishop Ulfilas, 311-381 A.D., the Ethiopic in the fifth century, the three Egyptian versions in the three dialects (the Sahidic of Upper Egypt, the Coptic of Central Egypt and the Bohairic of Lower Egypt) about 400 A.D., the Armenian from the beginning of the fifth century, and certain Arabic versions found in the Paris and London Polyglotts.

There are three ancient Greek versions later than the Septuagint of which only portions have come down to us. The oldest of these is that of *Aquila,* probably a Jewish proselyte of Pontus in the middle of the second century A.D. Jerome says that he was a pupil of Rabbi Akiba. His translation was slavishly literal. It had wide circulation among the Jews and was directed polemically against the Christians, as is proven by its rejection of the translation *Χριστός* for מָשִׁיחַ The translation of *Theodotion* (180-192 A.D.) was an attempt to improve upon the Septuagint. It is doubtful whether the author was a Jew or an Ebionite. At any rate his version found little acceptance among the Jews. Among Christians it was highly thought of and largely used

for the emendation of the Septuagint. His translation of Daniel finally took the place of the Septuagint. Origen gave the version of Theodotion a place in the Hexapla. The third Greek translation is that of *Symmachus,* an Ebionite, who flourished in the reign of Severus (193-211 A.D.) His translation adheres neither to the Hebrew nor the Septuagint but is in good Greek. The only Apocryphal additions in any of these three versions are the postscript to the Book of Job and the additions to Daniel in the version of Theodotion.

2. The *Targums* were renderings of Old Testament books into Aramaic. The word Targum is derived from an Aramaic root meaning to explain, the same root from which came the modern word dragoman. It occurs in Ezra 4:7. The Targums arose by a gradual process after Hebrew ceased to be the popular language of the Jews. Besides the reader in the synagogue an officer was appointed called a מְתוּרְגְּמָן or interpreter, whose duty it was after the reading of each verse in the Pentateuch, and after three verses in the Prophets, to render it into the language of the people. At first this was done orally, though private use may have been made of written translations. Later these renderings became fixed and conventional. The Targums were a long time attaining the form in which we possess them. They are not the work of any one time or a single group of men, but represent the customary synagogue renderings in different parts of the ancient Jewish world.

None of the Targums covers all the Old Testament but between them we have Aramaic renderings of all the books except Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah. These were not made into Aramaic because of the Aramaic por-

tions of Daniel and Ezra, Nehemiah being classed as one with Ezra.

There is mention of a Targum on Job in the time of Christ and it is probable that other Targums existed in his day. The dates of the Targums are difficult to determine. The oldest and best Targum on the Pentateuch is the one falsely assigned to Onkelos by a confusion of that name with Aquila, the author of the Greek version. This Targum was composed in the second half of the second century A.D. in Palestine, but did not receive official sanction there. It was accepted by the Jews in Babylon and called their own. Some scholars affirm that it was composed in Babylon. For the most part it is a simple translation of the Hebrew, though the poetical portions are more freely rendered or even paraphrased. It was printed at Bologna in 1482 without vowels and in 1491 with vowels.

Two later Targums on the Pentateuch are based upon that of Onkelos. One is commonly called the Pseudo-Jonathan because its author was falsely thought to have been the Jonathan who wrote the Targum on the Prophets. The other we possess only in fragments. It is called the Jerusalem Targum. Both these contain many legendary additions and are far inferior to that of Onkelos. Zunz assigns the Jerusalem Targum to the seventh century.

The oldest Targum on the Prophets is named for Jonathan ben Uzziel, a pupil of Hillel in the beginning of the first century A.D, though this authorship is very doubtful. It is much freer than the rendering of Onkelos and often amounts to a running commentary upon the text. In the historical books of the Former Prophets (Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings) the

translation adheres more closely to the original. It was first printed in 1494. A small fragment of another Targum on the Prophets called the Jerusalem is preserved on the margin of a manuscript called 154 by Kennicott.

There is a Targum on Psalms, Proverbs and Job which is falsely ascribed to Rabbi Joseph (A.D. 325) but is much later than his time. The portion from Proverbs is quite literal and is thought by Eichhorn to have been made from the Peshitta.

The Targums on the Megilloth and on Chronicles probably belong to an ancient Jerusalem Targum on the Kethubhim. Especially in the Song of Solomon they exhibit the utmost freedom, being really a paraphrastic commentary.

The Targums are valuable as indicating the current Jewish exegesis of their time but of small worth in determining questions of textual criticism.

3. The *Peshitta,* or old Syriac version, was so-called because it was the one in "common" use or because it was "simple" in giving the original meaning. The date of its origin is uncertain. The Christian church in the regions about Edessa was founded not later than 150 A.D. Since the people of that region were not acquainted with Greek it seems possible that this translation was made in the last half of the second century, although no sure evidence of its existence is known before 350 A.D. The translators follow the Hebrew closely but the version of the Chronicles reads like a Jewish Targum. From both these facts some have considered the Peshitta the work of Jews. On the other hand the uniform tradition of the Syrian church and the un-Jewish accuracy of the translation argue for a Chris-

tian origin. The similarity of the Syriac to Hebrew would account sufficiently for the Syrians' knowledge of the original. The hypothesis that the translators were Jewish Christians is plausible. The version of the Chronicles may have been taken from a Jewish source.

In many passages the Peshitta corresponds closely to the Septuagint. Some have concluded that it was made with special use of that version. There are, however, more passages in which it varies from the Septuagint. The high esteem in which the Septuagint was held even in Syria is shown by the later introduction of the Syro-Hexaplaric version. Thus the Peshitta may have been altered in conformity with the Septuagint. It is not equal to that version in its best parts but is much more even in its excellence. Like the Septuagint it was made by a number of men. It included originally only the canonical books, but the Apocrypha were added at an early date.

The *Syro-Hexaplaric* version was made from the Septuagint as found in Origen's Hexapla by the Monophysite bishop, Paul of Tella, in 618 A.D. From that time it was used by the Monophysites and the Peshitta by the Nestorians. The Syro-Hexaplaric is slavishly literal and often transfers Greek words into the Syriac text.

The similarity of the Peshitta to the Septuagint in many passages destroys its value as an independent witness to the original text. Yet the faithfulness of its rendering in other passages, where the Septuagint is weak, renders it an important link in the chain of history. All printed editions go back to the Paris (1645) and London (1657) Polyglotts and are rare. A new critical edition is greatly needed.

4. The *Vulgate* Latin version has received its name

from the name *Κοινή*, which was formerly applied to the Septuagint as the version in common use. This name was transferred to Jerome's version for the same reason in the thirteenth century. Jerome (346-420 A.D.) at first intended only to revise the current Itala version which had been made from the Septuagint and whose manuscripts were full of variations. At the request of Damasus, Bishop of Rome, he revised the Psalms (A.D. 383). This revision is still used in the church of St. Peter in Rome and is called the Roman Psalter. Then Jerome proceeded to Cæsarea where he found the text of the Septuagint in Origen's Hexapla. With this aid he made another version of the Psalms called the Gallican Psalter because of its extensive use in Gaul. He also rendered many other Old Testament books with the help of the Hexapla but all have been lost except the Book of Job.

Thence Jerome went to Bethlehem where he acquired a knowledge of Hebrew from Jewish teachers at considerable expense. There he made his memorable translation during fifteen years (390-405 A.D.). As the various books appeared he was urged by many of his friends, Augustine among them, not to depart from the Septuagint for which a superstitious reverence existed in his day. To these entreaties he partially yielded. He also consented to translate Tobit and Judith and to incorporate the other Apocrypha, although he clearly affirmed their inferiority to the canonical books.

For a long time the Itala was used side by side with the Vulgate. Gradually the superior excellence of the latter made itself felt and by 700 A.D. it had practically supplanted the Itala. Their co-existence contributed

greatly to the corruption of the text of the Vulgate. Familiar passages from the Itala found their way into the Vulgate and it became customary to add the Itala reading to that of Jerome. Many attempts to unify the text of the Vulgate were made. Lists of variations were compiled and the religious orders busied themselves with this herculean task. After the invention of printing and after the Reformation, new motives arose for the completion of this work. In 1546 the Council of Trent decreed that "the Vulgate which had been approved in the church by the long use of so many centuries should be held authentic in public reading, controversy, preaching and exposition, and that no one should dare or presume to reject it on any pretext whatever."

This made the editing of an authorized edition necessary. The Council appointed a commission for this purpose. They had scarcely begun their work when Pope Paul III ordered them to cease and send their manuscript to Rome. In 1563 the Council of Trent adjourned and Pope Pius IV confirmed its decrees. Later attempts on the part of scholars and publishers to secure a pure text of the Vulgate came to nothing. In 1587 Pope Sixtus V summoned another commission for this purpose and superintended their work with great care. This was published in 1590 with a bull declaring that this edition "is to be received and held as true, legitimate, authentic and undoubted in all public and private controversies, readings, preachings, and expositions," and prohibiting all other editions both past and future. Sixtus died in the year of this publication. Certain scholars prevailed upon succeeding popes to forbid the use of this edition until desired changes had been made. Finally Clement VIII in 1592

published this amended edition of the work of Sixtus V affirming in the preface, contrary to the facts of history, that it was the edition of Sixtus V. Such is the authorized edition of the Vulgate.

Despite its leanings toward the Septuagint and the great corruption of the text of the Vulgate, even in its modern form, it is the best and in some respects the most valuable of all ancient versions. It was the first book printed, an edition appearing in Mayence in 1450 and another dated edition in 1462.

VI. **Printed Editions and Polyglotts.** The oldest printed editions of the Hebrew Bible were from Jewish sources. An imperfect edition of the Psalms appeared in 1477 at Bologna. In 1488 the entire Bible was printed at Soncino. From this was derived the Brescia Bible in 1494 which Luther used in translating the Old Testament. Luther's copy is preserved in the Royal Library at Berlin. The principal *Rabbinical Bibles* (that is, those containing the Targums, Massora, or Rabbinical commentaries) are those of Bomberg which follows the Soncino Bible (Venice 1517, second edition 1525) and Buxtorf which follows the Complutensian text and that of Bomberg (Basel 1618). The best *critical editions* (those which contain the various readings) are those of Houbigant (Paris 1753) and Kennicott (Oxford 1776-80). De Rossi published his Variæ Lectiones separate from the text at Parma (1784). The Athias edition (Amsterdam 1661-67) collated many ancient manuscripts not hitherto used. It was followed by Vander Hooght's (Amsterdam 1705) upon whose text the modern Hebrew Bibles rest. The best recent editions are those of Hahn, Theile, Baer and Delitzsch, Ginsburg and Kittel.

A Polyglott presents the Massoretic text and several ancient versions in parallel columns. In ancient times Origen had set the example for this in his Hexapla which included the Hebrew text, its transliteration in Greek letters, the Septuagint and the versions of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. In modern times there have been four great polyglotts—the Complutensian, Antwerp, Paris and London.

1. The *Complutensian Polyglott* receives its name from Complutum (Alcala) in Spain, where it was prepared by Cardinal Ximenes assisted by several scholars of the University of Toledo and under the patronage of Pope Leo X. It was printed in 1514-1517, but the complete work was not published until after the death of the Cardinal in 1522. It is in six volumes. The first, on the Old Testament, contains the first edition of the Hebrew text issued under Christian auspices, the Vulgate, the Septuagint, and the Targum of Onkelos. In the sixth volume is a Hebrew grammar. There were six hundred copies published, most of which are now lost. The original manuscripts are in the library of the University of Madrid.

2. The *Antwerp Polyglott,* or Biblia Regia, was issued partly at the expense of Philip II of Spain in 1569-1572. It contains eight folio volumes, adding to the contents of the Complutensian Polyglott the Targum of Jonathan on the Prophets and a Targum on the Kethubhim, besides lexicons and treatises on Biblical subjects. Of this five hundred copies were printed. Like the Complutensian it is now very rare.

3. The *Paris Polyglott,* containing ten folio volumes, appeared in 1645. It follows the text of the Complutensian and Antwerp editions but adds also the Samari-

tan Pentateuch and version, the Peshitta, and an Arabic version. Of this, many copies are still extant.

4. The *London Polyglott,* edited by Bishop Brian Walton in 1656-7 in six folio volumes also follows the Complutensian text. It contains further still the Itala, an Ethiopic version of the Psalms and Canticles, the Apocrypha in Greek, Latin, Syriac and Arabic, the Targum of the Pseudo-Jonathan, the Jerusalem Targum on the Pentateuch and a Persian version. In 1669 Edmund Castell added to this his Heptaglot Lexicon in two volumes. Copies of this polyglott are not very rare.

VII. **Preservation of the Text.** With all these aids—the manuscripts, quotations, and ancient versions before us, the question remains how near our modern printed Hebrew Bibles are to the original autograph. How far back can we trace the text as we have it?

It is admitted that the Bible, like other books, was liable to errors of transmission. Before the invention of printing these errors were of various kinds: those of the eye, when the copyist read his manuscript wrong or omitted words by accident; those of the ear when one read the manuscript and another copied it; those of the memory, when the transcriber altered a passage after having read it correctly; and those of the judgment, when he divided sentences wrongly or introduced a marginal note into the text. There are also instances of intentional alteration in order to restore the supposed original or to substantiate some dogmatic opinion.

Despite all these causes of error all Hebrew manuscripts contain practically the same text. De Rossi and Kennicott collated the variations of several hundred manuscripts. These variations affect no vital doctrine.

They are all unintentional deviations from a fixed form which we call the Massoretic text. This first step carries back the text as we have it to the tenth century A.D.

For the centuries before this we are dependent upon quotations. These are reliable according to their nature. A quotation made from memory or where accuracy was unimportant has little value in textual criticism. But if the writer is known to be accurate in other matters or if he bases his argument upon the exact wording of the quotation, it becomes valuable. The quotations in Jerome, the Talmud, the Mishna, and Origen yield the same text which we now have. The variations are unimportant and where they occur, it is more likely that the text of the quotation is corrupt than that it represents a different original from our present text.

This conclusion is confirmed by the great care of the Massorites. They did not venture to change a single reading nor even alter the size of a letter. If a word was thought incorrect, they left it unchanged and put the suggested substitute in the margin. They merely perpetuated the text as they found it. The body of textual notes called the Massora makes it possible to trace the text far back of the oldest manuscripts. Thus we find essentially the same text which we possess at the time of the Mishna (200 A.D.).

The same period or a little earlier may be reached by an independent line of testimony, the ancient versions. Here also a word of warning is necessary. A version is not as reliable a witness in textual criticism as a manuscript, because the text of a version is not kept with as great care as that of the original. A comparatively pure text of the version must be secured before it is a safe

guide by which to correct the original. Furthermore the reliability of a version for this purpose depends upon the knowledge and sincerity of its makers and the general accuracy of its renderings. Of the four ancient versions, three, the Vulgate, the Peshitta and the better Targums, were evidently made from a text virtually identical with our own. This brings us to 150 A.D., the probable date of the Peshitta. At that time the text was considered fixed.

When we penetrate the period before Christ, serious difficulty is met with. The Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch differ widely at many points from the Massoretic text. Some have inferred from this that the text had not received its present traditional form when the Septuagint was made or that the Septuagint was taken from a form of the text which was a rival of that which has come down to us in the Hebrew. Of these surmises however there is not a particle of proof. If there had been a wide divergence among the Jews on so vital a matter as the Hebrew text, traces of their discussions would doubtless have remained. We know that the scribes "put a hedge about the law." They counted the letters, verses, and sections and noted the middle letter and word of each book. By these and other means they guarded the text from corruption. These facts contrast markedly with the imperfection of much of the Septuagint and the great corruption of the text of the whole. They show how unwise it is to correct the Hebrew according to the Septuagint. The very fact that the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion were thought necessary to remedy the deficiencies of the Septuagint, shows that the Septuagint is far from being a safe guide. These later Greek ver-

sions generally agree with the Hebrew against the Septuagint.

The Samaritan Pentateuch is far less reliable than the Hebrew text. Its variations in different manuscripts and its alterations made to uphold the Samaritan religion show how little confidence can be placed in it. Thus as far back as we can trace the Hebrew text it is substantially the same as now. It was in the hands of a people who had a superstitious reverence even for its letters and who counted it their highest distinction that unto them were committed the oracles of God (Rom. 3:2). Their scrupulous care was God's method of keeping those sacred scriptures in their purity.

Doubtless a few errors have crept into the text, in the spelling of proper names and in numbers. Green points out some of these as indicated by parallel passages (p. 145):

Gen. 10:3.....	compare.....	I Chron. 1:6
Gen. 10:4.....	"	I Chron. 1:7
Gen 25:15.....	"	I Chron. 1:30
II Sam. 8:13.....	"	I Chron. 18:16
II Sam. 8:4.....	"	I Chron. 18:4
II Sam. 24:13.....	"	I Chron. 21:12
I Kings 4:26.....	"	II Chron. 9:25
II Kings 8:26.....	"	II Chron. 22:2

They affect no vital part of the scripture. Furthermore the fact that these apparent errors have not been rectified is evidence of the great care with which the text has been preserved since they were made. They give no encouragement for the view that the text became fixed after it had become corrupt and in its corrupt form.

The following principles for deciding between various

readings are valuable: In general a reading should be found which will account for both the varying forms. Since errors of transmission commonly tend to simplify the text, rare words and forms are more probably original than simple and usual ones. The practice so common among modern exegetes of simplifying the text when they cannot make it yield a satisfactory sense is utterly unscientific, because it imagines that copyists have substituted rare and unfamiliar forms for those well known. Alteration of the text is seldom justifiable and then only after the most careful study. The subjective element enters so largely into the critical process that it should be used only as a last resort.

PART II

Special Introduction

FIRST DIVISION

THE LAW

I

PRELIMINARY: THE PENTATEUCH IN GENERAL

I. Name. The Hebrew name for the first division of the canon was תּוֹרָה "Law" (Josh. 1:7), or more fully "the book of the law" (Josh. 8:34), "the book of the law of Moses" (Josh. 8:31), "the book of the law of God" (Josh. 24:26), "the book of the law of Jehovah" (II Chron. 17:9), "the law of Moses" (I Kings 2:3). Though תּוֹרָה means from its etymology "instruction," in these and similar passages the word is used in its usual and restricted sense of law. The use of this name does not exclude the historical portions of the Pentateuch. The entire book is called "the law" because legislation forms so large an element in it. In post-biblical times the Jews called it "the five-fifths of the law" or simply "the fifths."

In the New Testament it is called "the book of the law" (Gal. 3:10), "the book of Moses" (Mark 12:26), "the law of the Lord" (Luke 2:23), "the law of Moses" (Luke 2:22), and "the law" (Matt. 12:5).

The name Pentateuch, *Πεντάτευχος*, comes from the Septuagint version and means "five-volume" properly an adjective limiting *Βίβλος* book. Many critics add the book of Joshua to the Pentateuch and name the whole the Hexateuch (Article "Hexateuch," H. D. B.). "The object of the change of name is to show that the 6 rather than the 5 form a complete literary whole, and

may be looked upon as one book in 6 parts." Since however the same sources are recognized by the critics in Judges, Samuel and Kings, these books might also be added. Indeed Ambrosius spoke of a Heptateuch (Strack's "Einleitung," p. 15) by adding Joshua and Judges, and the ancient Greek church of an Octateuch, adding Ruth. Neither the history of the books nor their internal character warrants this classification. While Joshua is the continuation of the Pentateuchal history, it depicts Israel in an entirely new relation as a nation settling in their own land.

II. **Author.**

1. *Testimony of the Old Testament.* Though the Pentateuch does not clearly state that it was all the work of Moses, several important parts are assigned to him. "And Moses wrote all the words of Jehovah" (Ex. 24:4) is thought to refer to the book of the covenant (Ex. 20-23). "And Moses wrote this law and delivered it unto the priests, the sons of Levi" (Deut. 31:9). "And it came to pass when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book until they were finished that Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of Jehovah saying take this book of the law and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of Jehovah, your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee" (Deut. 31:24-26). These passages presuppose a considerable book and though the old view, that they have reference to the entire Pentateuch, cannot be proved, they refer admittedly (Dillmann) to Deut. 5-26 and indicate a considerable literary activity on the part of Moses.

The later books of the Old Testament often speak of this book of Moses. The transaction at Ebal and Gerizim

presupposes a large book of Moses (Josh. 8:30-35). (Compare also Josh. 1:7-8 and 23:6; Judges 3:4.) David charged Solomon his son "as it is written in the law of Moses" (I Kings 2:3). (Compare also I Kings 8:9, 53-56; II Kings 14:6; 21:8 and 23:25.) The book discovered in the time of Josiah is called in II Kings 22:8 merely "the book of the law," but in the parallel passage, II Chron. 34:14, "a book of the law of Jehovah given by Moses" (notice also II Chron. 23:18; 25:4; 35:12). Ezra refers twice to the book of Moses (Ezra 3:2 and 6:18). In the book of Nehemiah we are told that Ezra read in "the book of the law of Moses" "from the morning until midday" (Neh. 8:1-8), and it is added, "also day by day from the first day unto the last day he read in the book of the law of God," evidently the same book which is called elsewhere "the book of the law of Moses" (Neh. 8:18). Neh. 13:1 also refers to "the book of Moses." In his prayer Daniel speaks of "the oath that is written in the law of Moses the servant of God" (Dan. 9:11, 13), and near the end of his book the prophet Malachi writes: "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb, for all Israel with the statutes and judgments." Besides these passages there are many other references to the Pentateuch which do not mention the author by name but nevertheless bring the book back to an early date (II Kings 17:34, 37; II Chron. 17:9; Isaiah 1:11; 2:3; 5:24, 25; 8:20; 30:9; Hos. 3:3; 4:4, 6, 10; 5:10; 8:12; 12:9 and 14:3; Amos 2:4; 4:4, 5; 5:22; Mic. 4:2; 5:7; 6:8, 10, 15). It is evident that the assertion of those who deny the Mosaic authorship, that these passages are later glosses, introduced in order to strengthen

the claim of the law, must be proved independently of the theory itself in order to have weight. Our only source of information concerning the Jewish tradition of the authorship of the Pentateuch in Old Testament times is in the text of the Old Testament as we have it. It is unscientific to rely upon the accuracy of the record when it suits the theory and deny the accuracy of passages which are fatal to the theory. While the Old Testament nowhere distinctly assigns its first five books as a whole to Moses, they are everywhere treated as his, and the Old Testament does not record a single expression of doubt on this subject.

2. *Testimony of the New Testament.* This agrees exactly with that of the Old Testament. More than a century before Christ the Old Testament was complete and was given visible form in the Septuagint version (250-150 B.C.) with which our Lord and the New Testament writers exhibit great familiarity. Jesus *Christ* quotes passages of the Pentateuch as from Moses. "Offer the gift that Moses commanded" (Matt. 8:4; compare Mark 1:44; Luke 5:14; Lev. 14:4, 10). "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives" (Matt. 19:8; Mark 10:5; compare Deut. 24:1). "For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother and, whoso curseth father or mother let him die the death" (Mark 7:10; compare Exod. 20:12 and 21:17). Our Lord could not have considered these passages merely as coming from Moses while the remainder of the Pentateuch was from others, for he speaks of "the book of Moses" (Mark 12:26; Luke 20:37, in reference to Ex. 3:6) and coördinates it with the Prophets as the first great division of the Hebrew scriptures. In the parable of the rich man and

Lazarus, Christ represents Abraham as saying: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead" (Luke 16:31). "All things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me" (Luke 24:44). The entire first division of the Old Testament must have been considered the work of Moses, for when the Jews quoted it as from Moses our Lord did not contradict them (Matt. 19:7; 22:24; Mark 12:19; Luke 20:28; John 9:28-29), and when Christ referred it to Moses they did not contradict him, anxious as they were to catch him in his words. The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch was evidently conceded by all Jews in Christ's time.

Those who admit the truthfulness of the gospel record and interpret Christ's words naturally, explain his testimony in two ways.

A. It is said that it was no part of our Lord's work to correct erroneous views on questions of authorship. As Dr. Briggs expresses it: "Jesus was not obliged to correct all the errors of his contemporaries. He did not correct their false views of science. He was the great physician but he did not teach medicine. He was greater than Solomon and yet he declined to decide questions of civil law and politics" ("Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," p. 29).

Answer.—This view has the advantage of retaining the divine knowledge of Christ, but it greatly lowers our conception of his mission. If our Lord knew that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch, he could easily have quoted from those books without mentioning Moses' name and still without offending the Jews, who

fondly believed that Moses wrote them. He uses other formulas of quotation in other passages which would have served equally well. It must not be forgotten also that our Lord was "the truth" (Jno. 14:6) and that he described his life mission to Pilate in these words: "To this end was I born and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth" (Jno. 18:37). His mission was in the religious sphere and it was not necessary to invade the domain of science or criticism on purpose to correct current errors. But it was necessary, when he did enter the critical sphere, to be absolutely true. Truth in the lower sphere was essential to the "faithful witness" in the higher sphere. Our Lord would not have destroyed men's confidence in him in religious matters by careless inaccuracy in a mere matter of authorship. Nor was the question of authorship so unimportant as the critics often say. Though it is the inspiration of the Old Testament which gives it authority, the human author is never ignored. More than half the Old Testament books are assigned to authors, our Lord and the Apostles generally quote by name, and the activity of the modern criticism itself is chiefly concerned with this very question—a question of the most vital importance to the scripture (see Dr. MacPheeters in Princeton Theological Review, July and Oct. 1903). Doubting Christ on these so-called minor points is always preparatory to doubting him on religious matters, as he said to Nicodemus: "If I have told you earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?" (Jno. 3:12).

B. The more common way of undermining the clear testimony of Christ to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is by asserting that he did not know.

"Jesus and his early disciples were Jews and as such, shared to a greater or less extent the traditional opinions of their countrymen. They would naturally therefore, think and speak of the Pentateuch as the work of Moses" ("World before Abraham," H. G. Mitchell p. 14). As proofs of the limited knowledge of Christ appeal is made to two passages. Christ declared his own ignorance concerning the time of the second advent. "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father" (Mark 13:32).

Answer.—Our Lord positively refused to mention the day and hour because he did not know them. Would he not have maintained the same silence concerning the authorship of Old Testament books if here too he had been ignorant?

The other passage is Phil. 2:7 where the apostle says that Christ Jesus "emptied himself, taking the form of a servant being made in the likeness of men."

Answer.—The relation of Christ's two natures to each other is a theological rather than an exegetical question. Yet it must be evident to any reader of the gospels that they do not represent Christ as confined to a merely human knowledge. He knew men's hearts (Luke 5:22; 6:8; 9:47; 11:17; Jno. 2:25; 16:19). He saw Nathanael beyond human sight (Jno. 1:48). He saw a man carrying a pitcher of whom his disciples knew nothing (Mark 14:13; Luke 22:10). He foretold his own death (Matt. 20:17-19), the destruction of Jerusalem (Matt. 24:1-2) and many other future events. If his contemporaries were mistaken in supposing Moses the author, our Lord would have known their error and corrected it, as he was so quick to do on other matters

attacking their vain traditions without mercy (Matt. 15:2-6; Mark 7:3-13), setting his "but I say unto you" over against the word of "them of old time." Furthermore if the Son of God emptied himself of his divine knowledge and became a mere man, we lose his infallibility, not only on questions of history but on questions of faith. If he was either essentially or temporarily merely a man, his dictum on religious matters has no greater authority than that of a man. This question must be fought out by the theologians. The Bible itself gives us no encouragement for limiting the knowledge of Christ beyond his own explicit limitation.

Passing to the *testimony of the New Testament writers,* this too is unanimous for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. It is quoted as the work of Moses (Acts 3:22; Rom. 10:5, 19; I Cor. 9:9). It is spoken of in general as "the law of Moses" (Acts 13:39; 15:5; 28:23; Heb. 10:28) and that Law was coördinated with the Prophets as one of the great divisions of the Hebrew scriptures (Acts 26:22; 28:23). Reading the Pentateuch is described as "reading" Moses. "For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day" (Acts 15:21). "But even unto this day when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart" (II Cor. 3:15). The triumphant in heaven "sing the song of Moses the servant of God" (Rev. 15:3). If Moses was not at least the author of this song (Ex. 15), this miserable falsehood is to be perpetuated even in heaven, but we are told "there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie" (Rev. 21:27).

3. *Modern Critical View.* Over against this uniform testimony of scripture in unalterable opposition stands the view of the modern negative criticism. With the most radical of these critics the New Testament testimony has no weight whatever. "We must either cast aside as worthless our dearly bought scientific method, or must forever cease to acknowledge the authority of the New Testament in the domain of the exegesis of the Old" (Kuenen. "Prophets and Prophecy," p. 487). For the sake of argument we are willing to ignore the New Testament witnesses for the moment and examine the arguments which are presented against the Mosaic authorship. Jean Astruc, the originator of the divisive hypothesis, held to the Mosaic authorship but thought that Moses used different documents in Genesis which were characterized by the divine names, Elohim and Jehovah. His successors, however, have assigned the various documents to a date much later than Moses, and most of them at present deny that Moses was the author even of those passages which are clearly assigned to him.

Their *arguments* are as follows:

1. The work of Moses "was not writing but acting, establishing institutions, and enkindling a new spiritual life." (Summarized from Dillmann by Green. General Int. p. 19.)

Answer.—All that we know of the work of Moses is derived from the records of scripture. These represent him not only as a great leader and legislator but as a writer. He was equipped as no other man of his time to write the history and legislation of the Pentateuch.

A. He had the learning. Being brought up in

Pharaoh's house (Ex. 2:10) he was doubtless, as Stephen said, "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (Acts 7:21). This learning included the knowledge of writing, as is now universally conceded.

B. He had the information necessary for writing the history. The Book of Genesis professes to record history before Moses. If there were written records of those patriarchal times kept by the Israelites in the land of Goshen, Moses, the champion and deliverer of his people, would certainly have them. If these records had been kept in the Egyptian archives from the days of Joseph, the prime minister, Moses would have had access to them in his early manhood. And if these stories were transmitted by oral tradition in Israel, Moses would be acquainted with them. In all the history from Exodus to Deuteronomy, to the time of his death, he was the most prominent actor and could have written it out of his own experience more easily than any contemporary, who would have been compelled to seek information on many points from Moses himself. He displays intimate knowledge of that history in his farewell address (Deut. 1-3). As to the legislation, Moses' forty years' residence at the court of the most highly civilized nation of antiquity was an excellent equipment to become the great Lawgiver of Israel.

C. He had the time. The forty years in Egypt are passed over with scarcely a word, and the forty years in Midian were occupied with no more strenuous work than tending the flocks of Jethro, his father-in-law. Anywhere in these eighty years there was time for writing the book of Genesis. During the forty years wandering in the wilderness, Moses was doubtless busy as the leader and judge of the great host. Yet we know

that at the suggestion of Jethro he appointed rulers in each tribe to relieve him of many duties and only great matters were brought to him (Ex. 18:13-26). Surely Moses could have found time in these forty years for writing the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy.

D. He had the genius of a writer. Moses' life was by no means filled with activity. In the forty years as a shepherd he had abundant opportunity for meditation upon the history of his people and the formation in his mind of that body of laws which would govern them when they should leave Egypt, which he foresaw must soon occur. Moses objected that he was not a "man of words" (Ex. 4:10), but God promised to equip him for his work. Thus with the meditative spirit and the divine inspiration he was peculiarly fitted for authorship.

2. The argument from silence. This is presented by Bacon in the bold asertion of "the indisputable fact that the history from Joshua to the Exile completely ignores the Levitical law" ("Genesis of Gen.," p. 38), that the Book of Chronicles "rewrites the history of the pre-exilic books of Samuel and Kings omitting and amending so as to bring the history into conformity with the ritual law" (p. 37), and further still, "the first trace of an allusion to anything contained in the priestly legislation of the Pentateuch, or to the existence of any ordinance of Moses concerning ritual, will be searched for in vain throughout the writings of the pre-exilic prophets" (p. 40). This critic urges especially four passages (Jer. 7:21-23; Amos 5:21-25; Micah 6:6-8 and Isa. 1:11-15) as evidence against the existence of the ceremonial laws in the time of those prophets

or at least against the recognition of their Mosaic authorship and divine authority.

Answer.—*A.* The historical books and the pre-exilic Prophets are not silent concerning the priestly laws. The references to the law of Moses are for the most part to Deuteronomy rather than Leviticus, since Leviticus was intended for the priests while Deuteronomy was a popular presentation of the law for the whole people. The historical books and the Prophets were intended for the people and, therefore, referred to the popularized form of the law. The references to Deuteronomy have been mentioned in the testimony of the later books to the Pentateuch. The very existence of the tabernacle and, later, of the temple implies the existence of a code of laws for the guidance of the priests. Deuteronomy was not such a law, but presupposes such a law as previously existing. References to Deuteronomy are, therefore, indirect proofs of the existence of Leviticus. Amos 4:4-5 and 5:21 seem to be direct references to Leviticus.

B. The comparative silence is due to two causes:

First. The history of Israel is a history of almost constant apostasy. The priests and the people were continually violating the law. The silence of the history concerning the law no more proves its non-existence than does the frequent mention of lynching in our daily papers prove that there is no law against it or no law except lynch-law. Violation of the law may be due to ignorance, but it is wilful ignorance.

Second. History does not deal with questions of law and ceremonial. These are introduced only incidentally. In times of faithfulness the silence of the history implies that the ceremonies were observed in the regular way.

The history records only the unusual, not the customary and ordinary things.

C. The passages mentioned do not imply the non-existence of the ceremonial law but are admonitions against the exaltation of the ceremonial above the moral law. This is shown by the emphasis laid upon the moral law in contrast with the ceremonial. God would not accept the sacrifices of his people when their hands were filled with blood and their hearts cherished sin. On this point Bacon replies: "One might indeed reconcile with a knowledge of the Pentateuch utterances of the prophets deprecating the too great regard paid to ritual and urging as of equal or greater importance the 'weightier matters of the law'; but how can it be supposed that the authors of these appeals to know when and where Yahweh had ever authorized anything of the kind, were aware of the existence of a Mosaic law, nine-tenths of which were devoted to inculcating this very thing in the most explicit terms as of immediate divine authority and with the imposition of most fearful penalties for its neglect" (pp. 41-42).

The reference is to the first two passages. "For I spake not unto your fathers nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices" (Jer. 7:22). This passage alludes to the fact that the ceremonial law was given after the moral law. Verse 23 refers to the first form of God's covenant given soon after crossing the Red Sea and before reaching Sinai (Ex. 15:26), whose content was moral rather than ceremonial—hence the preëminence of the moral law.

The other passage is Amos 5:25 "Have ye offered unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty

years, O house of Israel." This is an allusion to a former instance of idolatry to show that in all ages idolatry was Israel's besetting sin. Almost nothing is told in the Pentateuch concerning the history of Israel after God rejected that generation because of their sin. During thirty-eight years and a half they wandered in the wilderness. But Moses said: "They sacrificed to devils not to God" (Deut. 32:17). Even though the children of Israel offered sacrifices to Jehovah in the wilderness, it was not really to Jehovah but an empty form, to satisfy their own superstition. Such sacrifices were an abomination to God. It was because the same formalism clung to them in the time of Amos that God condemned their service. Thus these passages contain no argument against the existence of the book of Leviticus.

D. The argument from silence is notably weak. As is pointed out by Margoliouth it is based upon three syllogisms. "Had B existed in the time of the author A, A must have known of B. Had A known of B he must have mentioned or cited B. But A neither mentions nor cites B. Therefore B did not exist in A's time" ("Lines of Defence of Biblical Revelation," p. 175). The serious breaks in this argument are evident. At a time when books existed only in manuscript it was quite possible for a book to exist which was unknown to another writer on the same subject. Books became lost or unknown far more easily than to-day. If an edition of a thousand or more copies of a printed book may be lost in a generation so that it is very difficult to secure one how much more easily may a few manuscript copies be lost when the generation which prized them is dead. Furthermore it does not follow that a later writer would necessarily mention an earlier if he knew of his work.

Even where no purpose for silence can be discovered by us after so many centuries, such a purpose may have existed. And a later author may fail to mention an earlier because he had no occasion to do so. (For a notable instance of the failure of the argument from silence see Margoliouth "Lines of Defence of the Biblical Revelation," pp. 277-287.)

3. Geographical designations are used which could not have been used in the time of Moses. These we take up in the order of Strack ("Einleitung," pp. 24-26).

A. "On the other side of the Jordan" in reference to the eastern side thus indicating the writer's standpoint in Canaan where Moses never was (Deut. 1:1, 5; 3:8; 4:41-49).

Answer.—This expression is used of the territory west of the Jordan (Deut. 3:20, 25; Josh. 9:1, etc.), as well as east of it (Num. 22:1; 32:32, etc.). The standpoint is often mental (Num. 34:15; Josh. 1:14) and sometimes changes in a single verse (Num. 32:19). As the usual designation of the territory east of the Jordan it might have arisen while Jacob was in Canaan (Gen. 50:10-11).

B. The Hebrew יָם (sea) is the designation of the west even at the time of Israel's residence at Sinai although the sea was not west (Ex. 27:12; Num. 2:18; 3:23). This supposes a residence in Canaan where the sea was west.

Answer.—We know from the Tel-el-Amarna letters that the Hebrew language was used in Canaan before the Exodus. It may have been carried down by the patriarchs to Egypt and spoken by Israel in Goshen. If so יָם would have largely lost its original meaning and

signify simply "west." Furthermore the gulf of Suez was west of Israel when they were encamped at Sinai and that gulf is called יָם even at its narrowest part, by Pi-Hahiroth (Ex. 14:2, 16, 21, 23).

C. The name, Dan, is used, a name which Laish did not receive until after its conquest by the Danites (Gen. 14:14; Deut. 34:1).

Answer.—It is not certain that Gen. 14:14 refers to Laish. Perhaps it was another city called Dan. The name may have been a common one as the root, דִּין or הִין found in Aramaic as well as Hebrew expresses a common idea, to judge or rule. Deut. 34 was probably added at a later time since it records Moses' death.

D. Hormah is mentioned, a later name of Zephath (Num. 14:45; Deut. 1:44; Compare Judges 1:17).

Answer.—The name Hormah (destruction) was given to the region in Moses' time (Num. 21:3). The same name was given later to the city of Zephath (Judges 1:17).

E. The trans-Jordanic region is said to be called Havoth-Jair "unto this day" after Jair, the son of Manasseh (Deut. 3:14), although it was not named so until later (Num. 32:41; Josh. 13:30; Judges 10:4).

Answer.—Havoth-Jair means "villages of Jair." Num. 32:41, refers to Jair's naming certain villages in Gilead after himself and Deut. 3:14 to his doing the same in Bashan. The passages in Joshua and Judges refer to this region. There is no reason whatever to identify the Jair of Judges with the Jair of the Pentateuch. The former was probably a descendant of the latter who bore the same name and ruled in the same place.

F. Joseph said: "I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews" (Gen. 40:15).

Answer.—The origin of the word "Hebrew" is doubtful. It may refer to the people of a certain locality irrespective of their race. If the identification of the name with the Khabiri of the Tel-el-Amarna letters is correct, they were a powerful tribe living in the Negeb about 1400 B.C. against whom the king of Jerusalem had to appeal to Pharaoh for assistance. This region may have been called "the land of the Hebrews;" at any rate Abram is called a Hebrew (Gen. 14:13). He was recognized as a powerful prince (Gen. 23:6) as were also Isaac (Gen. 26:13) and Jacob (Gen. 34). The land where these people had lived for two centuries might well receive the name "the land of the Hebrews." Potiphar's wife twice spoke of Joseph as a Hebrew (Gen. 39:14, 17).

4. Archæological indications of a later date.

A. "The omer is the tenth part of an ephah" (Ex. 16:36).

Answer.—These two measures were known in Moses' time. The omer is mentioned as a measure five times in this chapter and elsewhere is called עִשָּׂרוֹן (Ex. 29:40; Lev. 14:21; Num. 15:6). The ephah is mentioned several times elsewhere (Lev. 5:11; 6:20; 19:36; Num. 5:15; 28:5; Deut. 25:14, 15). Since the omer as a measure is not mentioned outside of this chapter (Ex. 16), the explanation is not unnatural at the close. So far as the argument from this explanatory note has any force, it could only prove that the explanation was added to the text after Moses' time and can have no bearing on the authorship of the Pentateuch as a whole. If, however, this were an

explanatory note, that implies that the omer as a measure had gone out of use and, therefore, the book which mentions it must be old.

B. "Shekel of the sanctuary" (Ex. 30:13; 38:24-26). "This designation presupposes that the sanctuary with its cultus had already been a long time in existence" (Strack's "Einleitung," p. 25).

Answer.—The term "shekel of the sanctuary" was evidently a new one, for three times its weight is explained (Ex. 30:13; Lev. 27:25; Num. 3:47). Its use indicates nothing whatever concerning the age of the tabernacle or its cultus.

C. "Moses would hardly have spoken of Og king of Bashan, and his iron bed as in Deut. 3:11 in the fortieth year of the exodus since his hearers had conquered and killed this king in the same year" (Strack *id.*).

Answer.—The origin of Og and the remarkable size of his bedstead may not have been known to all the people whom Moses was addressing, even though they were his conquerors. At any rate in reviewing the history of Israel it was necessary to repeat many things already known to the people, since the book was meant for future generations.

5. Historical indications of a later date.

A. The poetical fragment quoted from "the book of the wars of Jehovah" (Num. 21:14-15) surely arose from a very ancient time; the section of the Pentateuch however in which it occurs, can neither be from Moses nor from the time of Moses, for the words are quoted as proof that the Arnon formed the border of Moab at that time. Such a proof however was superfluous for the contemporaries who had just crossed the Arnon" (Strack, *id.*).

Answer.—Moses was writing not only for his contemporaries, but for future generations for whom this explanation would not be superfluous.

B. "The Canaanites were then in the land" (Gen. 12:6; 13:7). This "then" surely indicates a time after the conquest of the land" (Strack).

Answer.—This statement in Gen. 12:6 is a natural part of the record. Without it the reader in Moses' time might have asked: Were the Canaanites in the land when God promised it to Abraham, as they are now? The fact of their presence adds to the greatness of God's promise. In Gen. 13:7 the same statement is a further explanation that there was not room for Abram's and Lot's cattle to be together. In each case "then" is in contrast with an earlier, not a later, time, when the Canaanite was not in the land.

C. "And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom before there reigned any king over the children of Israel" (Gen. 36:31).

Answer.—There are two distinct questions—Is any king mentioned here who was post-Mosaic? and does the statement before us imply a writer at the time of the kings? Concerning the first question there is no necessity of considering any of these eight kings post-Mosaic. There was a king in Edom in Moses' day (Num. 20:14), and the strength of the kingdom implies that it was not new (Num. 20:20). Esau had settled there before the death of Isaac and hence more than 430 years before the Exodus (Ex. 12:41). If to this be added the forty years in the wilderness we have more than 470 years in which the kingdom of Edom could have had eight kings before Moses wrote. On the other hand more than 350 years must have elapsed between

the death of Moses and the accession of Saul, the first king of Israel (I Kings 6:1; II Sam. 5:4; Acts 13:21; Num. 14:33). If the list of eight kings mentioned here was made in the time of Saul, each one must have reigned more than forty-five years. Hence it cannot be the intention of the writer to mention all the kings who reigned in Edom before there was a king in Israel but simply to state that Edom had kings before Israel had them. This statement would have been quite possible for Moses. Though there was no king in Israel in Moses' "time" he knew that Israel would have kings from God's promises to Abraham (Gen. 17:6), and to Jacob (Gen. 35:11), from Jacob's blessings upon Judah (Gen. 49:10), and from the prophecy of Balaam (Num. 24:7). Moses gave commands concerning the method of choosing the king and his character (Deut. 17:14-20). In the passage before us Moses comments upon the fact that Edom already had had eight kings although God's promise to his chosen people, the descendants of Jacob, was yet unfulfilled (See Green's "Unity of Genesis," pp. 425-9).

D. "And Abraham called the name of that place, 'Jehovah appeared,' as it is said to this day in the mount of Jehovah he shall be seen" (Gen. 22:14). It is said that this passage supposes a time after David had captured the temple mountain from the Jebusites since in Moses' time, Sinai was the mountain of revelation.

Answer.—Mt. Sinai was not intended to be a permanent place of revelation. Moses knew that the tabernacle was to rest some day in Canaan. Furthermore Moses is not here giving a name to the mountain but recording the name which Abraham had given.

E. "If that which is recorded in the Pentateuch about Moses and his family is put together, much is lacking which one would expect if Moses were the author and other things are not arranged as they would be if such were the case" (Strack, p. 26). The critics specially emphasize the Hebraized form of Moses' name, the omission of the names of the princess who saved Moses, of the Pharaohs of the oppression and the Exodus, different names of Moses' father-in-law (Ex. 2:18; 3:1; 4:18; 18:1; Num. 10:29), the single mention of Moses' Cushite wife (Num. 12:1), the silence concerning the death of Zipporah and the statement concerning the meekness of Moses (Num. 12:3).

Answer.—The Hebraized form of Moses' name is exactly what we would expect in view of his being a Hebrew. The princess may not have been altogether ignorant of a language, probably spoken by many hundred thousands in her land (Ex. 2:10). The omission of the names of the princess who saved Moses and of the Pharaohs with whom he had to do would be quite natural in Moses' time as being a matter of common report. If, however, Exodus was written much later than Moses from the traditions of the people, it is very strange that these names were not supplied. The four forms of the name of Moses' father-in-law, Reuel, Raguel, Jether, and Jethro, are evidently variations of two forms—one of them perhaps a proper name and the other a title. The variation may be due to the difficulty of transferring the name into Hebrew. The redactor of the Pentateuch, if such there were, did not think it necessary to make these names uniform and why should Moses? We are too far removed from the time of

Moses to explain his silence concerning his first wife's death and the brief mention of his second wife, though the taking of this second wife was not to Moses' credit and he would not therefore speak at length of it.

The statement that Moses was preëminently meek (Num. 12:3) is very appropriate in connection with his persecution by Miriam and Aaron. The word rendered meek is not found elsewhere in the Pentateuch, but the corresponding verb is used of the afflictions of Israel in Egypt and of Pharaoh's submitting himself to the lesson of the plagues which Jehovah sent (Ex. 10:3). This willingness to endure affliction patiently is the attribute predicated of Moses. The Psalmists did not hesitate to claim this virtue (Ps. 9:13-14; 10:17) for themselves, and our Lord said distinctly: "I am meek and lowly in heart" (Matt. 11:28). That Moses was meek the history abundantly shows. As a faithful historian Moses did not conceal his own faults and wrongdoing (Ex. 4:10; Num. 20:12; Deut. 1:37). Why should he not speak the truth about his virtues as our Lord did? If this argument against the Mosaic authorship is pressed, it can only prove that this verse was a later insertion, for though an appropriate comment it is not essential to the record. Some one, probably Joshua, added the account of Moses' death in Deuteronomy. He may have also added this note concerning the exalted character of the chief whom he had served so long.

F. The list of the stations at which Israel stopped in the wilderness (Num. 33) is imperfect. Moses would have made it clear and perfect.

Answer.—Strack admits that a fragment from Moses may be the basis of this chapter. According to this

argument this fragment of Moses must have contained a complete list of the places where Israel stopped. But if so how has the present so-called imperfect list been derived from Moses' perfect list? It is distinctly said that Moses made such a list (Num. 33:2). The difficulties of this chapter are not lessened by denying that Moses wrote it. If Moses did not write it, it is a forgery and it is inconceivable that a forger would have left it imperfect. The remaining two objections of Strack bear upon the literary analysis of the Pentateuch rather than its authorship (pp. 26-27).

4. *Positive Evidence of the Mosaic Authorship.* Besides the direct testimony of the Pentateuch itself that Moses wrote important parts of it and the uniform tradition indicated in the Old and the New Testaments that he was the author of the whole, this traditional view is upheld by other considerations.

(1) The *parts of the Pentateuch which refer to Egypt,* contain many marks of the author's familiarity with that country, which would have been difficult to obtain in Canaan several centuries after Moses.

A. Names. פּוֹטִיפַרַע (Gen. 41:45; 46:20) and the shorter form פּוֹטִיפַר (Gen. 37:36; 39:1) are Egyptian, the former meaning "whom Ra (the Sun-God) gave."

צָפְנַת פַּעְנֵחַ the name which Pharaoh gave Joseph (Gen. 41:45) is Egyptian and means according to the Septuagint *σωτὴρ κοσμοῦ*, an appropriate name for Joseph on account of his deliverance of Egypt in famine.

אָסְנַת, the name of Joseph's wife, is Egyptian (Gen. 41:45) and means "favorite of Neith."

אֹן (Gen. 41:45, 50; 46:20) is the old Egyptian name of Heliopolis.

רַעַמְסֵס (Gen. 47:11; Ex. 1:11; 12:37; Num. 33:3, 5) is a well-known Egyptian name.

פִּתֹם (Ex. 1:11) is probably the Egyptian Pi-Tum which is first mentioned in the monuments of the 19th dynasty, exactly in accord with the statement of Exodus.

B. Words. אַבְרֵךְ (Gen. 41:45) is a Hebraized Egyptian word (Siegfried and Stade. Hebr. Wörterbuch and Price in H. B. D.).

שַׁלִּיט (Gen. 42:6). This title of Joseph is found elsewhere only in Ecclesiastes, Ezra and Daniel, books which exhibit foreign influence. Joseph's brethren called him by the more familiar titles "lord of the land" or "ruler" (Gen. 42:30, 33; 45:8).

גָּבִיעַ, the divining cup of Joseph (Gen. 44: 2, 5 etc.). The word is found only once outside of the Pentateuch, in Jeremiah 35:5. Jeremiah had been in Egypt.

צְפַרְדֵּעַ (Ex. 7:27, etc.) and גֹּבַל (Ex. 9:31) are probably Egyptian words.

C. Customs. The marriage of eunuchs is not mentioned in the Old Testament outside of Gen. 37:36 and 39:1, which either indicates that in Egypt the name eunuch was loosely applied to any high officer of Pharaoh or that in Egypt it was customary for eunuchs to marry.

The custom of releasing or punishing prisoners on the king's birthday (Gen. 40:20). The same custom apparently existed at the court of Herod (Matt. 14:6; Mark 6:21), but not in Israel.

Wearing a signet ring and a chain of gold as a token of authority was unknown in Israel though it existed in Egypt, Persia, and Babylon (Gen. 41:42; Esther 3:10, 12; 8:2, 8, 10; Dan. 5:29).

The garments of linen given to Joseph would have been appropriate for a priest in Israel rather than a king or prime minister (Ex. 28:39; 39:27-29).

The separation of Joseph's brethren at table from him and from the Egyptians (Gen. 43:32), with the explanatory statement, "the Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews; for that is an abomination unto the Egyptians."

The remark (Gen. 46:34) "Every shepherd is an abomination to the Egyptians."

The author was familiar with the land tenure of the priests in Egypt (Gen. 47:22).

The account of the embalming of the bodies of Jacob and Joseph (Gen. 50:2, 26). The word חֲנֻט is not found elsewhere in the Old Testament except Cant. 2:13. Also the mention of the forty days necessary for embalming (Gen. 50:3), and of the sarcophagus in which Joseph's body was placed. The expression "unto this day" (Gen. 47:26) indicates a knowledge of Egypt later than Joseph.

D. Geography. The writer knew the Egyptian papyrus (Ex. 2:3) and the character of the Nile bank as well as the proximity of the sandy desert (Ex. 2:12), the location of Ramses, Succoth (Ex. 12:37), Etham (Ex. 13:20) and Pi-Hahiroth (Ex. 14:2). An intimate acquaintance with geography is indicated by the expression: "The wilderness hath shut them in" (Ex. 14:3). Indeed chapter 14 is almost incomprehensible without a knowledge of Egyptian geography.

(2) The *Levitical code of laws* found in Exodus (20-23; 25-31; 35-40), Leviticus and Numbers (5, 6, 8-10, 15-19) exhibits signs of having been promulgated by one in the circumstances of Moses. Rawlinson ("Lex

Mosaica," pp. 21-26) presents the arguments in the following order:

A. It is primitive. Professor Maine ("Ancient Law," p. 16) thinks that the mingling of religious, civil, moral and economical ordinances is a clear proof of great antiquity.

B. It is intermittent, interrupted by the historical narrative, precisely as might be expected if it was composed during the wilderness wanderings.

C. Many laws are suited only to this migratory life of the people—such as those which relate to the position of the various tribes in the camp and the moving of the tabernacle. Such laws would have been idle in Canaan.

D. Egyptian influence. The laws are sacerdotal, sacrificial and ceremonial as one would expect if given by Moses who was brought up in Egypt, where these ideas had their most perfect ancient development. Special indications of Egyptian influence are the triple division of the tabernacle, the ark of the covenant, the use of incense, the solemn assemblies, the endowment of the priesthood and the distinction between clean and unclean meats, all of which have their counterpart in ancient Egypt.

E. The careful avoidance of certain Egyptian religious peculiarities. There is no honorable mention of the sun such as is found in the Psalms (19:4), and no trace of the Egyptian doctrine of a future life, probably to avoid the idolatry and superstition which were connected with these ideas in Egypt.

F. Signs of Midianitish influence. The elders of the tribes suggested by Jethro were a distinctly Arabian institution—also the "blood feud" (Ex. 21:13; Num. 35:11-33). These institutions were appropriate to

Israel in the wilderness and were retained in Canaan. They could hardly have arisen when the people were living in towns and villages. The animals allowed to be eaten include those found in the Sinaitic peninsula—"the hart, the roebuck and the fallow deer, the wild goat, and the pygarg and the wild ox and the chamois" (Deut. 14:5).

In addition to the points mentioned by Rawlinson, Hommel cites several Egyptian loan-words in the Levitical legislation ("Hebrew tradition," p. 291).

שְׁתִי from the Egyptian *seta'* to spin.

זֶרֶת from Egyptian *tsert,* hand.

סְלְעָם from Egyptian *senham.*

אַחְלָמָה and לֶשֶׁם names of gems, the former equal to Egyptian *ekhnome* and the latter to Egyptian *neshem.*

פִּשֶּׁת and פִּשְׁתָּה from Egyptian *pesht.*

אֵיפָה equal to Egyptian *ipt,* borrowed from Babylonian *pitu.*

הִין equal to Egyptian *hin,* from Babylonian *gin.*

Hommel also emphasizes the Egyptian origin of the high-priest's breastplate (pp. 279-281) and the evidences of Midianitish influence upon Moses, as seen from ancient Minæan inscriptions (pp. 276-279).

(3) *Deuteronomy* also is appropriate to the time of Moses but does not fit the period of Manasseh or Josiah to which it is assigned by those who deny its Mosaic authorship. "The majority of critics believe this book of the law to have been the result of a pious fraud promulgated by Hilkiah and Shaphan with the intention of deceiving Josiah into the belief that the reforms which they desired were the express command of God revealed to Moses" (F. H. Woods in H. D. B. I. 368).

There is a difference of opinion on this subject among the critics, for Ryle says in the same Bible dictionary (Vol. 1 p. 602-603), "The finding of this book of the law in the temple is described as a fortuitous occurrence. There is no foundaton for the suggestion that Hilkiah himself had written the book and that the story of its finding was a fabrication. The account is straightforward and natural. It is generally agreed that the book may have been written in the reign of Manasseh, or in the early part of the reign of Josiah." That neither of these positions is tenable is seen from the following considerations.

A. The record itself gives no encouragement to the forgery hypothesis (II Kings 22:8, etc.). Hilkiah, Shaphan, Huldah, and Josiah seem all to have considered it an ancient book, the work of Moses.

B. No sufficient motive for the forgery of this book either in the time of Manasseh or Josiah can be cited. The critics say the object was to do away with the rival sanctuaries and make Jerusalem supreme. But the only sanctuaries which really rivalled Jerusalem had been swept away already by the captivity of the ten tribes. On the other hand if this was the object of the forgery it failed, for we are told: "Nevertheless the priests of the high places came not up to the altar of Jehovah in Jerusalem, but they did eat of the unleavened bread among their brethren" (II Kings 23:9).

C. There were many persons in Judah who had powerful motives for exposing this forgery if it was one. The wicked people whom the book condemned would have seized the opportunity of condemning it as a forgery. And even if the deception had not been noticed in Josiah's time, its wicked secret could not have been

kept in the reactionary days of his sons. The forgery hypothesis requires two improbabilities—that the author was a marvelous genius and that all the rest of the nation were fools.

D. There are many things in Deuteronomy which fit the time of Moses and not that of Manasseh and Josiah. The directions concerning the extermination of the Canaanites and the way of dealing with the cities of the land would be very strange in the seventh century but are quite natural in Moses' farewell address (Deut. 20:10-20). The allusion to the recent bondage in Egypt (Deut. 23:7), to the refusal of Ammon and Moab to furnish food to Israel in the wilderness (Deut. 23:4), to the war with Amalek (Deut. 25:17-19), all argue for the Mosaic authorship but are inexplicable in the time of the later kings. The regulations concerning the choice of a king and his duties (Deut. 17:14-20) could hardly have arisen four centuries after the establishment of the kingdom. The standpoint of the writer of Deuteronomy is before Israel entered Canaan.

E. The alleged differences of style and contradictions between Leviticus and Deuteronomy are due to difference of standpoint. Deuteronomy consists chiefly of popular addresses, while Leviticus is a codification of the laws for the use of the priests. Therefore Moses in Deuteronomy used a different style, omitted many details, and emphasized many practical points, often adding directions appropriate to the entrance of the people into Canaan.

(4) The fact that the great intervening figure of Moses and the extraordinary events attending the Exodus did not obscure the figures of the patriarchs in

the national consciousness of Israel is strong evidence that those figures were real ("Neueste Prinzipien" König, pp. 73-74). Great as Moses was in the mind of Israel his God is said to be the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, and these great names of the fathers could not be blotted out of the memory of Israel even by far more remarkable events in the time of Moses. This fact argues for the Mosaic authorship of Genesis indirectly since the vividness of the stories of Genesis implies an early date.

5. *Summary of Arguments concerning Authorship.* We have seen that the uniform testimony of the Pentateuch itself favors the view that Moses wrote it. This opinion was held without a dissenting voice by all the writers of the Old and New Testaments and by the Jewish nation and our Lord himself. We have weighed the arguments of modern criticism against this view and found them wanting. We have further found much indirect testimony that Moses was the author in three large sections: (1) Gen. 39 to Ex. 14; (2) The Levitical code including all the book of Leviticus and large parts of Exodus and Numbers; (3) The book of Deuteronomy. There remains one argument against the Mosaic authorship which it has seemed best to consider by itself, since it affects not only the authorship of the Pentateuch but its integrity and credibility, viz., the argument from the alleged composite nature of these books.

III. **Composition.** Five successive stages of the modern divisive criticism of the Pentateuch are distinguished by Green (H. C. of Pent. pp. 61-88).

1. The document hypothesis—that Moses used earlier documents in Genesis which were characterized by the

use of different divine names, Jehovah and Elohim. This was maintained by Jean Astruc (1753), Vitringa, Eichhorn and others. This principle of division was later applied to the other books of the Pentateuch in dependence upon Ex. 6:3 and all were made post-Mosaic.

2. The fragment hypothesis—that the Pentateuch is composed of thirty or more fragments altogether independent of each other. This view represented by Vater (1805), Hartman (1831) and others did not long find favor. It is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the document hypothesis.

3. The supplement hypothesis—a new form of the document hypothesis, by which the Elohist prepared a complete history and the Jehovist added to it, making occasional alterations of his own. This view was represented by Bleek, Tuch, Stähelin, De Wette, and Knobel.

4. Crystallization hypothesis—a modification of the last suggested by Ewald and Hupfeld, which increases the number of those who supplemented the history and asserts that they operated at different periods. It is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the supplement hypothesis.

5. Modified document hypothesis, which differs from the original document hypothesis by asserting that the Jehovist was a continuous and independent document. This view is current to-day and is represented with minor variations by Graf, Wellhausen, Kuenen, Cornill, Driver, Cheyne, Haupt, Briggs and many others.

It distinguishes four *documentary sources* of the Hexateuch besides the redactors.

P. The priestly document. This is considered the fundamental document of the Pentateuch, called by

Ewald "the book of origins," by Hupfeld "the first or older Elohist," and by Dillmann A. Driver thus characterizes this document: "Its language is that of a jurist, rather than a historian; it is circumstantial, formal and precise: a subject is developed systematically; and completeness of detail even at the cost of some repetition is regularly observed. Sentences are cast with great frequency into the same mould; and particular formulæ are constantly repeated, especially such as articulate the progress of the narrative. The attention paid by the author to numbers, chronology and other statistical data, will be evident" (Driver's I. L. O. T. p. 12). P. includes about one-half of Genesis, the greater part of Exodus, all of Leviticus, the greater part of Numbers and a few pieces at the beginning and end of Deuteronomy, besides several large sections of Joshua. It includes the so-called Law of Holiness (Lev. 17-26) which is denominated H (or by Dillmann S, as the law given at Sinai) and is considered by many older than the remainder of P.

E. Elohist, which begins surely Gen. 20 and perhaps 15:2—called by Hupfeld "the second or younger Elohist," by Ewald "the third writer," by Schrader, "the theocratic writer," and by Dillmann B or "the Israelish book of legends." Critics generally agree that E was a native of the Northern Kingdom.

J. Jahvist. Called by Tuch "the supplementer," by Ewald "the fourth writer," by Schrader "the prophetic writer," and by Dillmann C. Belonged to the Southern Kingdom and was vivid in his delineation of character and anthropomorphic in his conception of God.

D. Author of the greater part of Deuteronomy.

In regard to the dates of these various documents the common view is thus expressed by Mitchell: "The conclusion reached with respect to the age of the Pentateuch, then, is, that J originated about 850 and E about 800 B.C.; that the two, having been more or less revised and enlarged were united into a composite document before 639 B.C.; that D, which was discovered in 621 B.C. but must have been written some time before and revised in the reign of Manasseh, was incorporated with J E, early in the Captivity; and that the Pentateuch was practically completed by the addition of P, a product of the first half of the fifth century B.C. before 444, if not before 458, the date of Ezra's appearance in Palestine" ("The World before Abraham," p. 63). The more conservative critics however, such as Dillmann, Kittel, and Baudissin place P. before the Exile and the last named writer affirms that although J E is evidently a composite document, J and E cannot be separated with as great certainty as can J E be separated from P. The general characteristics of J and E are, however, plain. As Driver expresses it: "J if he dwells less than E upon concrete particulars, excels in the power of delineating life and character. His touch is singularly light, with a few strokes he paints a scene which before he has finished, is impressed indelibly upon his reader's memory. His dialogues especially (which are frequent) are remarkable for the delicacy and truthfulness with which character and emotions find expression in them" (L. O. T. p. 119). It is clearly to be understood that these several documents are said to have circulated as independent books for a long time before they were brought together. They were brought together by editors or redactors, commonly

called R, who are said to have made occasional alterations and additions of their own. On this point Dillmann says: "The further question still arises as to whether the three documents A, B, C [P. E. J.], have been wrought up by one or by several redactors (R.). Formerly the former hypothesis was the prevalent one. Recently, it has been contested by all who hold A [P] to be the latest document in the Hexateuch and post-exilic and it is maintained rather that B [E.] and C [J.] after each of them separately had passed through several enlarged editions, were at length combined and that at a later period by yet another hand they were joined to D before a final redactor wrought A [P] into this composite work" (Dillmann's Genesis p. 19).

The *arguments* by which the composite authorship of the Pentateuch is supported we will take singly and attempt to answer them.

1. The use of the divine names. This was the phenomenon which drew Astruc to the conclusion that Moses used different documents in Genesis, characterized respectively by the divine names, Jehovah and Elohim. Later it was claimed that Ex. 6:3 must have been written by an author (P) who had not thus far used the name Jehovah, therefore not the author of the entire book of Genesis.

Answer.—A. This argument ignores the etymology of the names of God and conceives of them as used interchangeably merely as a matter of habit. It is not claimed by the critics that J was ignorant of the name Elohim or P and E of the name Jehovah, but that each preferred one of these names. But if so, the question remains, why did J prefer the name Jehovah and E and P the name Elohim. To this important question

the divisive hypothesis gives no satisfactory answer. If the Pentateuch however be the work of one author, the use of these names is sufficiently clear. It is precisely that which the so-called characteristics of P, J and E, require. P is said to be cold, formal, systematic, logical; but it is precisely in such passages that one would expect Elohim, the general name for God, the name which has no special relation to Israel but is used many times in reference to the deities of the Gentiles. J on the other hand is said to be naïve, anthropomorphic in his conception of God; but these evidences of religious fervor would lead us to expect the proper national name of God, the name which emphasized his covenant relations with Israel. There are passages in which we cannot explain why one name of the deity is used rather than another but in the great majority of cases, any other name would be inappropriate. That these names are carefully used in their proper place has been shown by Hengstenberg and more recently by Green who says: "The divisive hypothesis can give no reason why the Elohist rather than the Jehovist should have given an account of the creation of the world and all that it contains; nor why the Jehovist rather than the Elohist should have described the beginnings of God's earthly kingdom in man's primeval condition and the mercy shown him after his fall; nor why the Elohist never speaks of an altar or sacrifice or invocation or any act of patriarchal worship—nor why Elohim regularly occurs when Gentiles are concerned, unless specific reference is made to the God of the patriarchs. All this is purely accidental on the divisive hypothesis. But such evident adaptation is not the work of chance. It can only result from the intelligent employment of the divine

names in accordance with their proper meaning and recognized usage" ("Unity of Genesis," pp. 547-8).

B. In order to substantiate this alleged dual use of the divine names it is necessary to do violence to the text. Elohim occurs in sections belonging to J (Gen. 7:9; 33:5, 11 etc.) and Jehovah in sections belonging to P (Gen. 7:16; 14:22; 17:1; 20:18; Ex. 18: six times). The critics rend apart Gen. 21:1-2; 22; Ex. 19:24; Num. 22-24, and other passages to make the text fit the theory. Sometimes they sweep aside difficulties by asserting that R altered the name, at others that the text is evidently corrupt. Neither of these suppositions however has any basis outside of the exigencies of the hypothesis. The hypothesis is said to be derived from the phenomena of the text, as we have it; but if those phenomena do not suit the hypothesis, they are rejected as worthless. May we not reasonably ask: If the text is corrupt how can we trust the hypothesis which is derived from it? The very existence of R and several R's is a baseless assumption made necessary by the difficulties of the divisive hypothesis.

C. The fact that the critics soon found it necessary to divide the Elohist into two—the first Elohist, P, and the second Elohist, E—and that many of them, while asserting the composite character of J E consider it very difficult to separate E from J is evidence that the use of these names is a very uncertain criterion by which to analyze the Pentateuch. If this test alone cannot distinguish P from J E, nor E. from J. it may as well be abandoned.

D. The passage Ex. 6:3 cannot possibly mean that its author was hitherto ignorant of or did not use the name Jehovah. There God said to Moses "I appeared

unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty (אֵל שַׁדַּי) but by my name Jehovah was I not known unto them."

We notice: (1) The name Jehovah is not here distinguished from Elohim but from El Shaddai, a name which in Genesis is used only five times (Gen. 17:1; 28:3; 35:11; 43:14; 48:3) while Elohim is used more than two hundred times. The name El Shaddai, is selected in Ex. 6:3 evidently because it emphasized certain attributes. But if the expression in the first part of the verse does not mean that El Shaddai was the name by which the patriarchs usually spoke of God, neither can the expression in the last part of the verse mean that the patriarchs did not know the name Jehovah.

(2) The redactor of the Pentateuch, if such there were, could not have considered the statement of Ex. 6:3 inconsistent with the frequent use of the name Jehovah by the patriarchs. Otherwise he would either have changed the statement in Exodus or the name Jehovah in Genesis. The many generations of Jews and Christians who were ignorant of the composite authorship of Genesis also saw nothing difficult in Ex. 6:3.

(3) The context of the passage and the *usus loquendi* of the expression, "to know the name" show clearly that the meaning is to have an experimental knowledge of the attributes emphasized by the name. Accordingly the etymology of the name was told to Moses (Ex. 3:14-15) the covenant connected with it is described (Ex. 6:4-8) and it is constantly repeated (Ex. 6:7, 8; 10:2; 16:12; 29:46, etc.). The word to know in the Old Testament generally includes the idea of apprehension

and the expression "to know the name of Jehovah" is used many times in this fuller sense of apprehending the divine attributes (I Kings 8:43; Ps. 9:11; 91:14; Is. 52:6; 64:1; Jer. 16:21; Ezek. 39:6-7). All this shows the meaning to be that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob knew God as a God of power but not as the God of the covenant. Whether the name of Jehovah was in existence before Moses, Ex. 6:3 does not say—merely that its significance was not appreciated. Possibly Moses introduced the name so familiar and precious in his time, into the earlier records. It is much more likely however both from the archaic form of the name and its probable identity with the Assyrian Jahu that the name was known to the patriarchs. As the rainbow long seen in the sky was given new meaning in the days of Noah, so the name Jehovah familiar to oppressed Israel became the pledge of the divine covenant.

2. Other words said to be peculiar to the several documents. It is said that P, J, E and D each has a vocabulary of his own. Driver gives a long list of words peculiar to P (L. O. T. pp. 131-5) and Strack does the same for all the sources adding a short list of cases where one and the same idea is differently expressed in the different documents ("Einleitung," pp. 43-53).

Answer.—A. Of course the argument has no weight unless the word or expression is one which both writers had occasion to use. Many of the words in Driver's list are confined to P because neither J, E, nor D had occasion to use them.

B. Where P uses one synonym and J E another, it is sometimes possible to see a good reason for the choice in the character of the discourse. Thus P and D use הוֹלִיד the more accurate expression while J uses יָלַד

because accuracy was essential in the parts of the Pentateuch assigned to P and D. P and J use the name Sinai, one of the three peaks of the mountain, while E and D speak in a general way of Horeb, the name of the whole mountain. In the former case definiteness was important (Ex. 16:1) in the latter not (Ex. 17:6; Deut. 1:2).

No continuous narrative ever displayed more unmistakable marks of unity than the story of hardening Pharaoh's heart (Ex. 4:21 to 14:8). Its progress must impress every careful reader. Yet because P and E use the expression חָזַק to harden the heart and J uses הִכְבִּיד the whole story is dissected by the critics and its meaning lost. These words are used with remarkable precision as the record lies before us.

(1) From the divine side. First God made Pharaoh's heart strong (חָזַק) then obdurate (אַקְשֶׁה) then heavy (הִכְבַּדְתִּי).

(2) From the human side. The condition of Pharaoh's heart and his action in hardening it alternate throughout the record. This arrangement is destroyed by the analysis:

Exodus	7:13	וַיֶּחֱזַק	Condition P.
"	8:11	וַיַּכְבֵּד	Action J.
"	8:15	וַיֶּחֱזַק	Condition P.
"	8:28	וַיַּכְבֵּד	Action J.
"	9:7	וַיַּכְבֵּד	Condition J.
"	9:34	וַיַּכְבֵּד	Action J.
"	9:35	וַיֶּחֱזַק	Condition P.

Other examples might be mentioned but these suffice

to show that the analysis of the Pentateuch is in direct violation of the usage of words throughout the Old Testament. In cases where we cannot see the reason for the choice of a word, it does not follow that there was no reason. It is quite conceivable that a writer would use one expression habitually in a certain connection and a synonymous expression in another connection.

C. The claim of a distinct vocabulary for P and J E can be maintained only by mutilating the record. If an expression usually found in P occurs in a J E section, the chapter and sometimes even the verse is divided. If narratives were left entire except in case of an expression which might be a later gloss, the argument would be much weakened. By this method any literary work could be divided into several sources, more or less complete (The analysis of the Parable of the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son in Green's H. C. of Pent. pp. 119-123 and "Romans Dissected" by E. D. McRealsham).

3. It is claimed that there are parallel accounts of the same event—such as two accounts of the creation, two stories of the flood, two records of the call of Moses, etc.

Answer.—These accounts are not really parallel. Some of them are merely similar events, as the two instances in which Abraham lied concerning his wife and the same action by Isaac. The redactor must have considered these quite distinct. In other cases there is a repetition from a different standpoint, as the account of the creation in Genesis 2 is from the standpoint of the God of revelation and providence. Sometimes the repetition is a characteristic of Hebrew style, which

often makes a general statement by way of introduction and then enlarges upon it. Thus Gen. 28:5 states briefly Jacob's departure for Padan Aram as introduction to the fuller account of his journey (Gen. 28:10 to 29:13). (Other examples: Green's H. C. of Pent. pp. 111-112.) Concerning the two stories of the flood Ewald says: "The story of the flood shone as a gleaming star before all others on the horizon of the Jehovistic and Elohistic documents" (Quoted by Rupprecht, "Das Rätsel des Fünfbuches Mose," p. 44). Yet the critics have been unable to extract two records of the flood even tolerably complete. The beginning of chapter seven is assigned to J. If so, we are told by J. that God commanded Noah to come with all his house into the ark, without telling a word about the building of the ark or the members of Noah's family. Chapter seven needs precisely the statement of Chap. 6:9-22 to make it complete or comprehensible. Gen. 8:13 says: "And Noah removed the covering of the ark and looked and behold the face of the ground was dry——" This is assigned to J but not another word of J is recorded till verse 20 where we read: "And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord." This serious gap is bridged by the intervening statements which the critics assign to P. Furthermore Gen. 9:1-17 (P) is not a useless repetition of Gen. 8:21-22 (J) but an enlargement of God's covenant with Noah after he had built the altar to Jehovah and recommenced his life upon earth. The so-called two stories of the flood need each other to form a complete record. It is also significant that the cuneiform story of the flood does not follow either one or the other document but contains both in much the same order as Genesis (J. D. Davis, "Genesis and Sem-

itic Tradition," pp. 128-9). The lives of the two Jonathan Edwards present parallels more remarkable than those of Genesis. Both were ministers and both college presidents. Both died soon after inauguration and both preached on the first Sabbath of the fatal year from the text: "This year thou shalt die." Surely some future critic will show that the two were one.

4. We are told that there are contradictions in these parallel accounts—that they do not harmonize with each other.

Answer.—It is noteworthy that the most difficult of these contradictions are found in Genesis where Moses was dependent either on ancient records or oral tradition.

(1) Thus according to Gen. 7:12, 17; 8:6, 10, 12; the flood lasted 54 days and according to Gen. 7:24 it lasted 150 days. It is apparent to any fair-minded reader that the forty days of Gen. 7:12, 17 and 8:6; do not mark the total duration of the flood but of the rain itself.

(2) Three explanations of the name Isaac are said to be given (Gen. 17:17; 18:12; 21:6). These explanations however are not mutually exclusive. It is quite natural that the child should be called Isaac (laughter) because both his father and mother laughed in incredulity at the thought of his birth and that in view of his name his mother laughed with joy after his birth.

(3) Again the critics insist that those who sold Joseph into Egypt are said to be Ishmaelites in Gen. 37:25-27 and 39:1 and Midianites in Gen. 37:28, 36.

Answer.—There is no contradiction in these names. In Judges 7:8 is found the record that Gideon did

battle against the Midianites and yet we read concerning the conquered (8:24), "They had golden earrings because they were Ishmaelites." Evidently the term Ishmaelites included the narrower name Midianites. Accordingly they are sometimes called by one name and sometimes by the other. Others suggest that the term Ishmaelite may be a general designation for any trader as they were preëminent in commerce. The admission of a final redactor is fatal to the assertion of irreconcilable contradictions in the Pentateuch. A man of such marvelous ability as he must have possessed would have seen the contradictions if they were as patent as they are said to be, and would have removed them.

Over against these arguments for the composite authorship of the Pentateuch, stands the remarkable evidence of plan and arrangement in these five books. This is not denied by the critics. They explain the unity of plan by the skill of the final redactor and by his using P the most systematic and complete of the documents as the basis of his completed work. But this explanation is insufficient. It is true that a historian may use many varying and even contradictory sources, weighing them against each other and working them over into a unity. In doing so he does not retain, however, the language of the originals but fuses them into a unity of which he is the author. Quite different from this is the critical explanation of the Pentateuch. It is said to have been a process of stratification in which the language and forms of the original can even now be distinguished. The redactor merely fastened the documents together, making a few changes or additions. Under these circumstances, we assert that the

orderly history we possess is utterly impossible and the theory is contradicted by its own assumption, for the redactor is an impossible character. He showed wonderful genius in bringing order out of the chaos of documents and yet he was such a bungler that the errors of his work have come down to us as evidences of his folly.

It is not claimed that there are no difficulties in accepting the unity and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. But it is claimed that the difficulties of accepting the story of its origin which has been made for us by the keen critical insight of a century and more of critics, tax our credulity far more than the traditional view. This plan presents a mountain of difficulty for every mole hill which it removes and to all its specious arguments we reply, *non sequitur.*

I

GENESIS

I. **Name.** The Hebrews named each book of the Pentateuch by its opening word or words. Accordingly the first book of Moses was named בְּרֵאשִׁית, a name which was transliterated into Greek by Origen *Βρησιθ*. The Septuagint called the book *Γένεσις* from the headings of its ten parts (Gen. 2:4; 5:1; 6:9; 10:1; 11:10; 11:27; 25:12; 25:19; 36:1; 37:2) in each of which that word occurs in the translation. The Vulgate and most modern translations have adopted this Greek name. It means origin, birth, generation and is an appropriate equivalent of the Hebrew plural תּוֹלְדוֹת which is the key-word of the book.

II. **Author and Composition** (see Chapter on Pentateuch).

III. **Purpose.** As this Greek name implies, the purpose of the book is to trace the beginnings of history. The viewpoint however is not that of the modern historian who gathers together all possible material and arranges it in chronological order. It is rather to present a brief outline of the history of divine revelation up to the beginning of national life in Israel. The perfection and purpose of creation and the temporary thwarting of that purpose by the sin of man are the logical introduction to the history. The history itself exhibits the gradual process of selection among the

descendants of Adam up to the point where selection ceased, and the entire body of one man's descendants were to be the chosen vehicle for transmitting God's revelation and salvation to all mankind. The development of this process included the rejection of Cain, the appointment of Seth, the destruction and purification of the world by the flood, the preservation of Noah and his family to be a new beginning of the race, the choice of Shem, the scattering of mankind from Babel, the call of Abraham, the miraculous birth of Isaac and his consecration to God on one of the mountains of Moriah, the selection of the younger son Jacob and the history of his chastening which finally resulted in bringing him and his household into Egypt, the cradle of Israel's national life. In Genesis God deals with individuals and families while in the later books He deals with nations and especially the Hebrew nation through the instrumentality of national and religious leaders.

Genesis is related to the Pentateuch as the Pentateuch is related to the Old Testament and the Old Testament to the New. Genesis describes the ground and how God planted in it the seed of a pure national life while the later books of the Pentateuch describe the growth of that seed into a full-grown tree. The later books of the Old Testament describe the growth on that tree of a special branch and twig and the gradual unfolding of a bud into a flower until the coming of the fruit. In the New Testament we see the perfect fruit plucked from the tree and given for the healing of the nations.

IV. **Divisions.**

Introduction Chapters 1-11:

(*a*) The Creation 1:1 to 2:3.

(*b*) History till the flood 2:4 to 5:32.

(*c*) The Flood and History till Abraham Chaps. 6-11.

1. The History of Abraham including the early history of Isaac 12:1 to 25:18.

2. The History of Jacob including that of Isaac and the twelve patriarchs until Joseph's death 25:19 to 50:26.

V. **Sources.** We have seen in the previous chapter that if there were written records in Israel Moses would certainly have them, and if there were oral traditions he would know them. In this connection a few significant facts and suggestions may be mentioned:

1. More than three-quarters of Genesis (chapters 12-50) refers to events in the life-time of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—events which Joseph would undoubtedly know and which his evident interest in his family might have inspired him to collect. His powerful position in Egypt would have made it easy for him to collect material for a history of his people. The personal tone of the record of Abraham's prayer for Sodom and of his offering Isaac as well as that of Joseph's making himself known to his brethren is just what we would expect if the record of Moses were based upon an earlier autobiographical record.

2. Abraham came from a country where the knowledge of writing and reading was common and from an important city mentioned in the code of Hammurabi, probably the Amraphel of Gen. 14. In that country traditions of the creation and the flood were preserved, which have much in common with those in Genesis. That is the very country also in which Genesis places the site of the garden of Eden and where the confusion of tongues is said to have occurred. There if anywhere

the remains of an original revelation concerning creation and an accurate story of the flood would be handed down. What could be more natural than that Abraham carried such records and genealogies with him from the banks of the Euphrates to the land of Canaan? "Abraham gave all that he had unto Isaac" (Gen. 25:5). Perhaps these priceless records were among his possessions. If so they went down with Jacob into Egypt and form the basis of Gen. 1-11 as written by Moses.

3. We know that in one matter at least tradition was handed down from Joseph to Moses through the four centuries of sojourn in Egypt. Joseph made his brothers promise to carry up his bones from Egypt (Gen. 50:25). Joseph's body was kept carefully until Moses' time, was carried out of Egypt by the Israelites (Ex. 13:19) and buried at Shechem (Josh. 24:32). Coffins of Joseph's time and earlier were inscribed with extracts from the Egyptian Book of the Dead. But if the coffins of Egyptian priests and princes bore inscriptions from Egyptian holy books, why should not the coffin of Joseph, the savior of Israel and the Premier of Egypt, bear records of the traditions of his ancestors? Such a plausible suggestion shows how easily reliable sources for Genesis could have come into the hands of Moses.

VI. Chronology. The figures of the genealogies in Gen. 5 and 11 may be tabulated and dates derived from them as follows:

	Age at Son's Birth	Remainder of Life	Total Life	Birth Anno Mundi	Death Anno Mundi
Adam.....	130	800	930	1	930
Seth.....	105	807	912	130	1042
Enos.....	90	815	905	235	1140
Cainan.....	70	840	910	325	1235
Mahalaleel....	65	830	895	395	1290
Jared.....	162	800	962	460	1422
Enoch.....	65	300	365	622	987
Methuselah...	187	782	969	687	1656
Lamech.....	182	595	777	874	1651
Noah.....	500	450	950	1056	2006
Date of Flood[1].	...	...	...	....	1656
Shem.....	100	500	600	1556	2156
Arphaxad.....	35	403	438	1656	2093
Salah.....	30	403	433	1691	2124
Eber.....	34	430	464	1721	2185
Peleg.....	30	209	239	1755	1994
Reu.....	32	207	239	1785	2024
Serug.....	30	200	230	1817	2047
Nahor.....	29	119	148	1847	1995
Terah.....	70	135	205	1876	2081
Abram.....	100[2]	75	175[3]	1946	2121

These dates would allow only about four thousand years from Adam to Christ since the date of Abraham must have been about 2040-1865 B.C. But the Egyptian and Babylonian civilizations were highly developed before 4000 B.C. The dates of this table therefore are not true. The explanation of the figures in the geneal-

[1] Gen. 7:11. [2] Gen. 21:5. [3] Gen. 25:7.

ogies of Gen. 5 and 11 is to be found in the following considerations:

1. The genealogies of scripture are not intended to be complete but mention only a few outstanding names. That in Matthew 1 has three lists of fourteen generations each, covering respectively three unequal periods: Abraham to David, nearly a thousand years, David to the Exile about four centuries, and the Exile to Christ more than five centuries. The genealogy in Ex. 6:16-24 makes Moses the great-grandson of Levi though 430 years intervened (Ex. 12:40). Many names are omitted in these lists.

2. There are indications that the list of names in Genesis 5 and 11 is not complete. The total length of time from Adam to the flood and from the flood to Abraham is never mentioned in scripture although the period from Joseph to Moses (Ex. 12:40) and that from the Exodus to the building of the temple (I Kings 6:1) are mentioned. The fact that there are just ten names in each list also suggests that a similar arrangement may have been made as in the first chapter of Matthew. Furthermore if the dates are true, Adam was contemporary with every generation till the flood except Noah. Indeed Noah knew all but three of the generations before him. Methuselah died and Arphaxad was born in the year of the flood (notice however Gen. 11:10). Shem survived Abraham thirty-five years, Salah three years and Eber sixty-four years. Such conclusions are contrary to the spirit of the record which presupposes a much longer gap between Adam and Noah and between Noah and Abraham.

3. The regular formula is: "A lived —— years and begat B. And A. lived after he begat B. —— years

and begat sons and daughters. And B. lived —— years and begat C., etc." The word יָלַד however is sometimes used of succeeding generations. Zilpah is said to have borne her great-grandchildren (Gen. 46:18) and Bilhah her grandchildren (Gen. 46:25). Canaan is said to have begotten whole nations (Gen. 10:15-18). Also notice Exodus 1:5: "All the souls that came out of the loins of Jacob were seventy souls." This includes grandchildren. In the formula the meaning is not necessarily that B. is the literal son of A. and that A. was —— years old when B. was born. B. may be the literal son or a distant descendant, and if the latter the age of A. is his age at the birth of the child from whom B. was descended. Thus many centuries may intervene between A. and B. No chronology is intended in these figures. Their purpose is not to show the age of the world but the effect of sin upon human vitality and longevity (For further discussion see Bibliotheca Sacra April 1890).

II

EXODUS

I. **Name.** The book was named by the Jews from its first words וְאֵלֶּה שְׁמוֹת or more briefly שְׁמוֹת The Septuagint named it Ἔξοδος from its contents. This was adopted in the Vulgate and from it in the modern versions.

II. **Author and Composition** (see Chapter on Pentateuch).

III. **Theme.** The second book of Moses is closely connected with the first. It begins with the conjunction "and" introducing a list of the twelve sons of Jacob who came down into Egypt. It takes up the story of Genesis at the death of Joseph and carries it on through the establishment of the theocracy at Mt. Sinai. It records the beginnings of God's fulfilment of His promise to Abraham to give the land of Canaan to his descendants.

The special phase of this fulfilment, with which Exodus deals, is the beginning of separate national existence. The growth from a small group of families numbering only seventy souls into a real nation is passed over with a few words because that period of over three centuries contained nothing germane to the purpose of the religious historian. The oppression, however, which resulted in the still greater growth of Israel and finally in their deliverance furnished an important subject, which would be calculated to stimulate the gratitude

and faith of God's people in future generations. Exodus records the beginnings of national life in Israel, as Genesis the beginnings of religious life. Exodus therefore appropriately recounts the origin of Israel's greatest national feast, the Passover. It follows the people in the wilderness only as far as Mt. Sinai where God gave the Magna Charta of their national life. Certain statutes given at that time fill the concluding chapters of the book.

IV. **Divisions.**

1. The History of Israel till their arrival at Mt. Sinai 1:1 to 19:2.

a. The oppression of Israel, chapter 1.

b. The training of Moses the deliverer, chapter 2.

c. His call and messages to Pharaoh, chapters 3-11.

d. The institution of the Passover, 12:1 to 13:16.

e. Israel's journeys to Sinai 13:17 to 19:2.

2. The Revelations at Mt. Sinai, 19:3 to 40:38, including the Decalogue and various moral and ceremonial laws.

V. **Contemporaneous History.** The dates of the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt are somewhat difficult to obtain. In I Kings 6:1 we are told that 480 years intervened between the Exodus and the beginning of Solomon's temple, and that the latter event occurred in the fourth year of Solomon's reign. This would give about 1495 B.C. as the date of the Exodus and the 430 years of Israel's sojourn in Egypt (Ex. 12:40-41) would be from 1925 to 1495 B.C. Recent discoveries, however, place the date of Hammurabi, probably the Biblical Amraphel Abraham's contemporary, about 1974-1920 B.C. and thus fix Abraham's date at about 2040-1865 B.C. If so, Isaac was born about 1940 B.C. (Gen. 21:5)

and Jacob 1880 B.C. (Gen. 25:26) and Jacob went down to Egypt 1750 B.C. (Gen. 47:9). The dates of the sojourn in Egypt would then be 1750-1320 B.C. This date for the Exodus agrees almost exactly with the estimates of the best Egyptologists.

From Egyptian sources Petrie dates the Exodus at 1204 B.C. while Budge and most other authorities prefer about 1320 B.C. At any rate, Joseph is thought to have come into Egypt during the reign of Apepa II, the last great Hyksos or Shepherd King. These conquerors were Asiatics. Some historians think they were a mixed race, partly Semitic, and others that they were Hittites. According to Manetho they ruled Egypt 511 years. Joseph was elevated to power toward the close of their supremacy. This would explain the silence of the Egyptian records concerning Joseph, as well as the Bible statement: "Now there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph" (Ex. 1:8). It is natural that a king who belonged to a dynasty of foreign usurpers should be willing to give a place in the land to the Israelites but that later kings of native rulers should despise Israel and oppress them. The Hyksos kings ruled at Tanis, identified with Zoan, in the eastern part of the Delta, not far from the land of Goshen and the later site of the treasure cities, Pithom and Ramses. They constitute the fifteenth and sixteenth dynasties and were so far assimilated to Egyptian customs that the remains of their work resemble that of other Egyptian kings.

During the seventeenth dynasty the native kings whose capital was at Thebes made war upon the Hyksos but they were not driven out until the eighteenth dynasty. By far the most powerful king of the eight-

eenth dynasty was Thothmes III who had led fifteen expeditions against the princes in Syria and subjugated them. On the walls of the temple at Karnak is a list of 119 places in Syria which were subject to this king. Two of them Jacob-El and Joseph-El are thought to be places named after Jacob and Joseph. Thothmes III carried his conquests as far as the upper Euphrates. The Aegean islands as well as Cyprus and part of Asia Minor were also subject to him. Great light is shed upon the history of this time by the tablets discovered at Tel-el-Amarna in 1887. They are letters and reports from the rulers of the Syrian provinces mostly to Amenophis III, the third king after Thothmes III and are in the Babylonian language, the language of diplomacy in that time. They refer to a people called Khabiri who are identified by some with the Hebrews. They are mentioned by the king of Jerusalem as attacking various places in southern Palestine. If the identification is correct, we must conclude either that the Exodus occurred much earlier than has been thought (1400 B.C.) and the attacks referred to were the conquests of Canaan described in Joshua or that some of the Hebrews had left Egypt before the Exodus and were seeking to establish themselves in southern Palestine. The latter hypothesis is more probable. Hommel thinks the tribe of Asher emigrated from Egypt before the other tribes and concerning the relations of Israel to Canaan during their sojourn in Egypt he says: "It is extremely probable in view of the intimate relation between Egypt and Palestine that the Israelites in the land of Goshen maintained continual intercourse and uninterrupted contact with the latter country, throughout the whole 430 years of their stay in Egypt" ("He-

brew Tradition," p. 226). The Khabiri, however, may have been the designation of the people of a certain region in southern Palestine rather than the name of a race. Such was probably the original usage of the name Hebrew.

The successor of Amenophis III was Amenophis IV, famous as the Pharaoh who attempted to revolutionize the Egyptian religion by substituting the worship of the sun, in order to unify the various religions of his empire. The attempt failed and the new religion was overthrown soon after his death. The internal disturbances caused by Amenophis IV were quieted by Harmais, counted by some the last Pharaoh of the 18th and by others the first of the 19th dynasty. He was succeeded by Ramses I who after a short reign was followed by Seti I and he in turn by Ramses II, known as Ramses the Great.

This monarch is generally regarded as the Pharaoh of the oppression. He waged war against the Hittites many years, but finally made peace with them, according to which northern Syria became tributary to the Hittites and Palestine remained subject to Egypt. He reigned sixty-seven years. Fully half of all the extant temples of Egypt are from his time and he is the best known of all the Pharaohs. He strengthened the Delta towns and made Tanis (Zoan) his favorite residence. His power in Syria was far weaker than that of Thothmes III two centuries before him. He was succeeded by his son Manephthah, probably the Pharaoh of the Exodus. This agrees with scripture. The oppression of Israel had begun when Moses was born but Moses was eighty years old at the time of the Exodus (Ex. 7:7). Naturally the oppression would begin at

the opening of a new reign. Furthermore what we know from secular history of the haughty bearing of Ramses II harmonizes with the character of the oppressor of Israel. The fact that he strengthened the cities of the Delta and lived there, not far from the land of Goshen, agrees with the statement that he made Israel work with rigor in brick and mortar and that they built the cities Pithom and Ramses. Thus the Exodus occurred thirteen or more years after the accession of Manephthah.

Little is known of that monarch. A peculiar record concerning him was discovered in 1896. It records the names of certain localities which he subjugated in the following order: "The Hittite land, Canaan, Ashkelon, Gezer, Janoah, Ysiri'r—'all lands.'" The connection of the last name shows apparently that it belongs to some people living in southern Palestine, although Janoah was a city of the Lebanon. Some think it is a reference to Israel. If so, it is the only mention of them in Egyptian inscriptions thus far discovered. Aside from this list there is no mention of an Asiatic campaign of Manephthah. The date of another campaign in this same account is the fifth year of his reign. This would be before the Exodus if the birth of Moses occurred after the accession of Ramses II. If therefore the hypothesis already suggested be true, that some of the Hebrews had broken away from the oppression of Egypt and sought a refuge in southern Palestine before the Exodus, they may have been the people whom Manephthah encountered there. Both the Hebrew and the Egyptian accounts of this matter are so meagre that we must suspend judgment until we have more light. All the light we have tends to confirm the accuracy of

the Bible record. And if that record is true, we would not expect any mention of Israel either in the inscriptions of the Pharaoh whom God judged or the Pharaoh whose hosts God overthrew in the Red Sea.

According to a newer view, Thothmes III of the eighteenth dynasty was the Pharaoh of the oppression and either Amenophis II or Thothmes IV the Pharaoh of the Exodus. The chief argument for this theory is chronological. The usual date of the Exodus (1320 B.C.) does not allow for the 480 years of I Kings 6:1 between the Exodus and the building of the temple (1015 B.C.). The 480 years would bring us back to the end of the reign of Thothmes III. Furthermore what is known of that monarch and his time agrees with the Bible record. The picture of brick-making by captives, bearing the superscription, "Be not idle," is from his reign. On this theory Queen Hatasu, the daughter of Thothmes I, who reigned with her brother Thothmes II and during the minority of Thothmes III may have been the Pharaoh's daughter who brought up the child Moses and the Khabiri of the Tel-el-Amarna letters may have been the hosts of Israel who were threatening to overthrow the king of Jerusalem.

The facts are too meager to decide positively between these two theories. Still the stronger arguments favor the theory which makes Ramses II the Pharaoh of the oppression and Manephthah the Pharaoh of the Exodus.

III

LEVITICUS

I. **Name.** The third book of Moses was named by the Jews from its opening word וַיִּקְרָא In the Mishna it is variously designated תּוֹרַת כֹּהֲנִים, סֵפֶר כֹּהֲנִים and סֵפֶר קָרְבָּנוֹת according to the character of its contents. On the same principle it is named in the Septuagint *Λευιτικόν* and by Philo *Λευιτικὴ Βίβλος*. From the Septuagint the Vulgate derived the name Liber Leviticus. The latter name has come down as the designation in many modern versions.

II. **Author and Composition** (see Chapter on Pentateuch).

III. **Purpose.** This book, as the names in the Mishna and Septuagint show, was intended for the priests. It was their guide-book for the worship of Jehovah and the instruction of Israel in their part of that worship. It stands appropriately after Exodus which closes with the dedication of the completed tabernacle. And yet it is markedly distinct from Exodus both in the manner and matter of its revelation. This distinction is shown in the first verse of the book. "And the Lord called unto Moses and spake unto him out of the tabernacle of the congregation" (Lev. 1:1). As Donald Fraser well remarks: "We have in Leviticus, not the Lawgiver speaking in awful tones or writing on tablets of stones, but the Portion of Israel, dwelling

in the midst of His people and teaching them how they might draw near to His presence and abide in communion with Him" ("Synoptical Lectures," Vol. 1, p. 29). Leviticus is also clearly distinct in purpose from Deuteronomy. The latter is a resumé of the law for popular use while Leviticus is a code intended for the priests. Leviticus has its inspired commentary in the epistle to the Hebrews, which describes the true method of approach to God in the dispensation of grace, as Leviticus had shown it in the dispensation of law.

IV. **Divisions.**

1. The way to approach God, culminating in the ceremony of the day of atonement. Chapters 1-16.
   - *a.* Laws of sacrifices. Chapters 1-7.
   - *b.* The consecration of the priests. Chapters 8-9.
   - *c.* The sin of Nadab and Abihu and laws occasioned thereby. Chapter 10.
   - *d.* Laws of purification. Chapters 11-15.
   - *e.* The ceremony of the day of atonement. Chapter 16.

2. The way to maintain fellowship with God. Chapters 17-27.
   - *a.* Prohibitions for priests and people. Chapters 17-22.
   - *b.* Laws of religious festivals. Chapters 23-25.
   - *c.* Supplementary laws. Chapters 26-27.

IV

NUMBERS

I. **Name.** The Jews named the book וַיְדַבֵּר from its first word or more commonly from the fifth word בְּמִדְבָּר which indicates its contents. The Mishna and Talmud for the same reason designated it חֻמָּשׁ הַפְּקוּדִים. With this last designation the Septuagint name (Ἀριθμοί) agrees. The Vulgate translated the Greek name, Liber Numeri. The names in modern versions are derived from the Vulgate.

II. **Author and Composition** (see Chapter on Pentateuch).

III. **Theme.** This book takes up the history of the wilderness wanderings where the book of Exodus left it, after the revelation at Mt. Sinai and carries it on to the verge of Israel's entrance into the promised land. Thus it appropriately stands after Leviticus which contains the body of priestly legislation given at Mt. Sinai, and before Deuteronomy, which contains the farewell addresses of Moses to the people just before his death. It covers thirty-eight years of history. Yet the history is fullest in the first and last of these years, the intervening years being years of apostasy and containing nothing of permanent religious value. Chapter 33 contains a complete list of the camping places of Israel from their leaving Egypt till they reached the plains of Moab. Certain laws are also introduced with the occasion which gave rise to them.

IV. **Divisions.**

1. Preparations for leaving Mt. Sinai 1:1 to 10:10.
   a. Numbering and arrangement of the people Chapters 1-3.
   b. Duties of the Levites. Chapter 4.
   c. Various laws 5:1 to 9:14.
   d. Guidance by the pillar of cloud and fire 9:15 to 10:10.
2. March from Mt. Sinai to the Plains of Moab 10:11 to 22:1.
   a. Events on the way to the wilderness of Paran 10:11 to 12:16.
   b. Events and laws at Kadesh-Barnea 13:1 to 20:21.
   c. Events on the way from Kadesh to Moab 20:22 to 22:1.
3. Events on the Plains of Moab 22:2 to 36:13.
   a. The Prophecies of Balaam 22:2 to 24:25.
   b. The sin of Israel. Chapter 25.
   c. The numbering of Israel and the request of Zelophehad's daughters 26:1 to 27:14.
   d. Moses' death and successor foretold 27:15-23.
   e. Laws of offerings and vows. Chapters 28-30.
   f. Conquest of the Midianites. Chapter 31.
   g. The trans-Jordanic settlements. Chapter 32.
   h. Stations in the wilderness. Chapter 33.
   i. Regulations concerning the division of Canaan. Chapters 34-36.

V

DEUTERONOMY

I. **Name.** The book is designated in the Hebrew Bible by its first two words, אֵלֶּה הַדְּבָרִים or simply דְּבָרִים In the Massorah it is named from its contents מִשְׁנֵה תוֹרָה (Deut. 17:18). For the same reason it is called *Δευτερονόμιον* in the Septuagint. This name was transliterated in the Vulgate, Liber Deuteronomii, and from the Vulgate has been adopted in modern versions.

II. **Author and Composition** (see Chapter on the Pentateuch).

III. **Purpose.** This book is the appropriate close of the books of history and legislation which Moses left. It contains little history but that little presupposes that the events of Exodus and Numbers had already been recorded. It is not legislation in the ordinary sense but is a résumé of legislation already given with exhortation and warning. The spirit and the matter of Deuteronomy thus presuppose the existence of the book of Leviticus and the legislative portion of Exodus. On the other hand both the historical and legislative parts of the book are written from a standpoint before the events recorded in Joshua had occurred. Deuteronomy is preparatory for Joshua. Yet the death of Moses with which this book closes separates its history from that of Joshua which records the administration of Moses' successor.

Deuteronomy is Moses' parting discourse before his death. It forms the basis of the exhortations of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Our Lord paid special honor to this book since all three of the quotations with which he overcame Satan were taken from it (Deut. 8:3; 6:16; and 10:20).

IV. **Divisions.** Introduction 1:1-5.

1. Moses' first address reviewing Israel's experiences from Sinai to Moab 1:6 to 4:40.

Supplementary statements 4:41-49.

2. Moses' second address. Chapters 5-26. For the most part this is a popular presentation of the laws with exhortations to obedience.

3. Moses' third address foretelling the results of disobedience. Chapters 27-28.

The Covenant at Moab and Moses' farewell and death. Chapters 29-34.

SECOND DIVISION

THE PROPHETS

Section I. The Former Prophets

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The second of the three divisions of the Hebrew canon is the נְבִיאִים or Prophets, so-called not because of the prophetic contents of the books but because of the prophetic office of the writers. These are divided into the נְבִיאִים רִאשׁוֹנִים or Former Prophets and the אַחֲרוֹנִים-נְבִיאִים or Latter Prophets. In the Hebrew classification, each of these subdivisions contains four books, the former including Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings and the latter Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve. Thus the double books, Samuel and Kings, were counted as one and the Minor Prophets as one.

The Former Prophets trace the history of Israel from the prophetic standpoint from the beginning of Joshua's leadership after the death of Moses to the Exile in Babylon, nearly seven hundred years. They portray the realization of the national life foretold in the Pentateuch.

I

JOSHUA

I. **Name.** The book is named in all ancient and modern versions as well as in the Hebrew Bible from its principal character, Joshua. This name has four forms, יְהוֹשֻׁעַ (Deut. 3:21; Judges 2:7) usually יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, occasionally הוֹשֵׁעַ (Num. 13:8, 16; Deut. 32:44) and later shortened to יֵשׁוּעַ (Neh. 8:17) Stade thinks it is a Hiphil of יָשַׁע It is better to consider it a compound, meaning "Jehovah is salvation." In the Septuagint it is called *Ἰησοῦς Ναυη* (Joshua the son of Nun) and in the Vulgate Liber Josue.

II. **Composition.** This book is classed by the divisive criticism with the books Gen.-Deut. in the Hexateuch because of its contents but especially because it is said to have originated from the same literary sources as the Pentateuch. Geddes, 1792, was the first to count Joshua with the Pentateuch while de Wette, Bleek and Ewald first extended to it the documentary theory. Driver describes its origin as follows: "In chapters 1-12 the main narrative consists of a work, itself also in parts composite, which appears to be the continuation of J E, though whether its component parts are definitely J and E, or whether it is rather the work of the writer who combined J and E, into a whole, and in this book, perhaps, permitted himself the use of other independent sources, may be an open question. The use of P in these chapters is rare. In chapters 13-24, on the

contrary, especially in the topographical descriptions, the work of P predominates, and the passages derived from J E are decidedly less numerous than in the first part of the book. There is, however, another element in the book of Joshua besides J E and P. In this book, J E, before it was combined with P, passed through the hands of a writer who expanded it in different ways, and who, being strongly imbued with the spirit of Deuteronomy, may be termed the Deuteronomic editor, and denoted by the abbreviation D 2" (p. 104).

Answer.—1. This view depends in large part upon the assumption that the critical analysis of the Pentateuch is proven, an assumption which we have already shown to be unfounded. The evident uncertainty of the critics in the application of the principles of Pentateuchal analysis to the book of Joshua is itself an argument against that analysis.

2. The book is not a literary part of the Hexateuch. Historically it begins an entirely new epoch under a new leader. If the fact that it continues the history of the Pentateuch be used as an argument for its literary unity with the Pentateuch, it is evident that Judges, Samuel and Kings, which continue the history still further should likewise be included.

Baudissin justifies the name Hexateuch only on the ground that Joshua came from the same sources as the first five books. He adds: "It cannot be said with definiteness, how far the book, as it lies before us, ever formed a whole with the Pentateuch" ("Die Bucher des A. T.," p. 170). Cornill likewise concludes that Joshua was separated from the Pentateuch, at least so far as P is concerned, before the time of Ezra ("Einleitung," p. 83) and affirms: "Joshua presents an essentially

different physiognomy from the Pentateuch" (p. 80). The style and vocabulary of Joshua as well as certain grammatical forms differ radically from the Pentateuch. Strack mentions these examples (p. 63).

גִּבֹּרֵי חַיִל found four times in Joshua but in Pent. בְּנֵי חַיִל (Deut. 3:18.)

עַם הַמִּלְחָמָה five times in Joshua but nowhere else in the Old Testament while the Pentateuch uses אַנְשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה נוֹעָק (Josh 8:16) not in the Pentateuch.

"Jahve, the God of Israel," found fourteen times in Joshua but only twice in the Pentateuch (Ex. 5:1; 32:27). These peculiarities of Joshua Strack explains as evidences of material not found in the Pentateuch. He also mentions a few others which he considers to be due to carelessness in the preservation of the text of Joshua as compared with that of the Pentateuch.

קָנוֹא (Josh. 24:19) but in the Pentateuch קַנָּא.

יְרֵחוֹ or יְרִיחוֹ in Joshua but יֶרַח in the Pentateuch.

הוּא in Joshua but in the Pentateuch often הִוא This list may be largely extended.. The explanation of Strack for these phenomena is unsatisfactory. Even Cornill's theory, that the book of Joshua from an early period had a history entirely independent of the Pentateuch, is not sufficient. The facts point clearly to difference of authorship.

3. The same arguments which prove the unity of Genesis and the other books of Moses, prove the unity of Joshua. The book proceeds upon a consistent plan and there is no satisfactory evidence which can justify its analysis.

III. **Author.** No certain answer can be given to the

question of the authorship of the book. The Talmudic tradition which many Christian writers, both ancient and modern, have followed, that Joshua wrote it, is based upon the statement of Josh. 24:26 that "Joshua wrote these words in the book of the Law of God." The traditional name of the book does not necessarily imply that Joshua was its author. It may have received his name as the principal actor. Still the fact that the book terminates with Joshua's death as the books of Moses with Moses' death makes this theory natural.

Others have suggested that Eleazar or Phinehas wrote it from material composed by Joshua. The essential thing is that it was composed by a contemporary of Joshua or so soon after his time that the history it contains is reliable. Strack evidently feels the danger of giving the book a later date, for he endeavors to retain its credibility by the unwarranted assumption that it contains very ancient traditions "in part perhaps even from the time of Joshua." Other critics boldly assert that its history is unreliable and especially that its account of the sudden conquest of Canaan in Joshua's lifetime is far less probable than the gradual conquest which is said to be an underlying conception of the book of Judges. The allusion to the Book of Jasher (Josh. 10:13 compare II Sam. 1:18) does not require a date after the time of David, for the Book of Jasher was probably not written at one time but was a collection of poems recounting heroic deeds, to which additions were made from time to time.

On the other hand Josh. 15:63 must have been written before the time of David (II Sam. 5:7) and Josh. 16:10 before the time of Solomon (I Kings

9:16). A comparison of Josh. 15:17 with Judges 1:13 and of Josh. 19:47 with Judges 18:29 seems to point to the time of the Judges as the period when the book was written. Apparently the writer had crossed the Jordan with Israel (5:1) and wrote before the death of Rahab (6:25). There is no historical evidence for the critical assumption that together with the other books of the second division of the canon, Joshua did not become canonical until long after it was written (300-200 B.C.)

IV. **Purpose.** The book is historically the connecting link between the preparatory stages of Israel's life as recounted in the Pentateuch and their settled national life in Canaan. It records the passage from the wilderness to Canaan as Exodus had recorded the passage from Egypt to the wilderness. Thus the miraculous passage of the Jordan has somewhat the same place in the book of Joshua as the miraculous passage of the Red Sea in the book of Exodus.

Joshua is related to the later books of Moses as fulfilment is related to promise. The man Joshua underwent a long period of testing for his great office. His leadership of Israel against Amalek at Rephidim, his companionship with Moses in the sacred privilege of revelation on Mt. Sinai, and his steadfast faith in believing with Caleb that God was able to conquer the land of promise for Israel were a peculiar equipment to take up the work where Moses had laid it down. For this God had appointed him before Moses' death (Deut. 1:38; Josh. 1:1). The book which bears his name is related to the Pentateuch, somewhat as the Acts of the Apostles is related to the Gospels. It records the beginning of the settled national life for which all

the preparations, historical and legislative, are found in the books of Moses.

On the other hand Joshua carries the history only through one generation, until the land had been divided by lot and Joshua, the last connecting link with Moses, the Lawgiver and founder of the nation, had given his farewell addresses. There the book of Judges takes up the history.

V. Divisions.

1. The conquest of the land. Chapters 1-12.
   - *a.* God charges Joshua. Chapter 1.
   - *b.* The spies at Jericho. Chapter 2.
   - *c.* The passage of the Jordan. Chapter 3.
   - *d.* Preparations for the conquest. Chapters 4-5.
   - *e.* Capture of Jericho. Chapter 6.
   - *f.* Defeat, then conquest of Ai. Chapters 7-8.
   - *g.* Gibeon spared. Other conquests. Chapters 9-12.

2. Division of the land. Chapters 13-22. Inheritance by tribes, special inheritance of Caleb, cities of refuge, and cities for the Levites, concluding with the return of the trans-Jordanic tribes.

3. Farewell address, death, and burial of Joshua. Chapters 23-24.

II

JUDGES

I. **Name.** The book is named in the oldest Jewish records סֵפֶר שֹׁפְטִים or simply שֹׁפְטִים from the men who delivered and ruled over Israel in the period between Joshua and Samuel. This title is transliterated by Origen and translated in the Septuagint, Peshitta, and Vulgate. Hence it has been adopted in modern versions.

II. **Composition.** There is considerable divergence among the critics concerning the details of the composition of the book, especially on two points: (1) whether the same sources, J and E, which are said to be found in the Hexateuch are present also in Judges, or whether the sources of Judges are different from those in the Hexateuch and (2) whether the main body of the book is based upon an earlier pre-Deuteronomic book (before 621 B. C. when Deuteronomy is said to have been found in the temple). There is practical agreement however in the opinion that the introduction (1:1 to 2:5) and the appendices (chapters 17-18 and 19-21) are later additions, many critics considering these two appendices to have been by different authors. The Song of Deborah (Judges 5) and the story of Abimelech (Judges 9) are generally considered older than the other parts of the book.

The clearest and most highly developed form of the critical opinion concerning the main portion of this book (2:6 to 16:31) is that of Moore who agrees in the main with Budde. The former describes it as follows:

"Early in the ninth century the traditions of the invasion and settlement of Western Palestine, of the subsequent conflicts in various parts of the land with the native population or with new invaders, and of the heroic deeds of Israel's leaders and champions in these struggles, were collected and fixed in writing, probably as part of a historical work which included the patriarchal age, the immigration from Egypt, and the history of Israel under the kingdom down to the author's own time (J)."

"Perhaps a century later another book of similar character and scope was written, containing in part the same stories, but in a form adhering less closely to historical reality (E). A second recension of this work (E 2) bears very distinctly the impress of the prophetic movement of the 8th century, and specifically of Hosea's teaching, and may be assigned to the end of the 8th or the beginning of the 7th century. . . . The Book of Judges in J E seems to have begun with the death of Joshua, and to have closed with the great discourse of Samuel (I Sam. 12) a division which certainly existed in E. It probably contained all the stories of our Judges except that of Othniel; and in view of the character of the succeeding redactions, Rje (the Redactor who combined J and E) may with greater justice than D (the later Deuteronomic editor) be regarded as the true author of the book. J E is a work of the 7th century but antedates the reforms of Josiah (621 B.C.) and the dominant influence of Jeremiah and the Deuteronomy. Early in the 6th century an author belonging to the Deuteronomic school took this work as the basis of his own. As the traces of his hand do not extend to I Sam. 1-12 nor to Judges 1:1 to 2:5;

17-21, we infer that D's book included only Judges 2:6 to 16:31 (or perhaps 15:20). . . . The Deuteronomic Judges did not supplant the older work upon which it was founded. J E's history was in existence long after the exile. In the 5th or 4th century B.C., an editor united the two books, and produced the present Book of Judges" (Commentary on Judges, G. F. Moore, pp. xxxiii-xxxv).

Answer.—Two points are concerned in this critical view, the unity of the book and the date of its authorship. The unity of the book is evidenced by its orderly arrangement which would be incredible if it came into its present form in the way described. Richard Valpy French (Lex Mosaica pp. 198-199) has adduced the following linguistic evidences of unity:

1. Between the main body of the book and the appendix.

מַחֲנֵה of troops (4:6-7; 20:37).

מְיָמִים יָמִימָה (11:40; 21:19).

פָּנַע (8:21; 15:12; 18:25).

נוֹעַק (6:34-35; 18:22-23, etc.).

שָׁלַח חֶרֶב (3:22; 8:10, 20; 9:54; 20:2, 15, 17, 25, 35, 46).

2. Between the appendix and the introduction.

Compare 1:1-2 with 20:18, 23, 27.

יוֹאֵל לָשֶׁבֶת (1:27, 35; 17:11; 19:6).

שָׁלַח בָּאֵשׁ (1:8; 20:48).

הִכָּה לְפִי חֶרֶב (1:8, 25; 20:48).

נָתַן בְּיַד (1:2; 18:10; 20:28).

3. Between the introduction and the main body of the book:

1:16 compare 4:11.

עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה (1:21; 6:24; 10:4; 15:19; 19:30).

נָתַן בְּיַד (1:2; 2:14, 23; 6:1; 7:7, 13:1; 15:12; 18:10; 20:28).

Though it is altogether probable that the author made use of previous written traditions coming from the time of the Judges, there is not sufficient evidence that he embodied these sources in his work or that the book went through so many successive redactions.

III. **Author.** For our knowledge of the date of the author of the book we are entirely dependent upon Hebrew tradition and internal evidence. These two witnesses are in remarkable agreement. According to Rabbinic tradition Samuel was the author. Internal evidence confines the date of the book to about Samuel's time. The statement of Judges 1:21 that "the Jebusites dwell with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem unto this day" could not have been written after David's conquest of the stronghold of Zion (II Sam. 5:6-8) nor the statement of Judges 1:29 that the Canaanites dwelt in Gezer after Pharaoh burned the city, drove out the Canaanites, and gave it to Solomon (I Kings 9:16). Furthermore Isaiah 9 contains several references to Judges 4, 5, and 6, and the name Jerubbaal (Judges 6:32) seems to have been changed to Jerubbesheth (II Sam. 11:21) in the time of David. On the other hand, the statement found four times in Judges, "In those days there was no king in Israel" (17:6; 18:1; 19:1; 21:25) to which twice is added "Every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (17:6; 21:25) seems to imply that the writer lived after the establishment of the kingdom. Thus we are driven to the conclusion of French: "The strongest

probability exists from the foregoing data for assigning the authorship of the Book to Samuel or to one of his prophetic school. The period was either the time of Saul or the early years of the reign of David" ("Lex Mosaica," p. 191).

IV. **Purpose.** The book of Judges records all that is known of the history of Israel from the death of Joshua to the time of Samuel, a period of about two centuries. It shows the increasing desire of the people for some leader like the nations around them, a desire which culminated in the days of Samuel in the appointment of a king. God did not yield to this desire immediately but from time to time called forth special deliverers, whose work resembled that of a king. The judges however were not chosen from any one tribe, nor was there a regular succession of them. They were exceptional and their tenure of office was temporary. Indeed they were rather generals than judges, in the English sense. A similar name is known to have existed in Phenicia and Livy speaks of the rulers of Carthage as "*suffetes.*"

The purpose of this book was not historical but religious. It was intended by repeated instances from Israel's past to show how God punished his people for their sins and forgave and delivered them, when they repented. As in the other historical books long periods are passed by without a word and in the so-called minor judges (Shamgar, Tola, Jair, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon) the statements are very brief. The heroic deeds of all the judges are represented as being done by power received from God. The period was one of apostasy. And yet there remained a few who continued to worship Jehovah. This is evidenced by the mention of the

tabernacle at Shiloh (18:31) of the annual feast (21:19) of the highest priest and the ark of the covenant (20:27-28). Furthermore sacrifices were offered (13:15-16, 23; 20:26; 21:4) circumcision was observed (14:3; 15:18) and vows were made unto Jehovah (11:30; 13:5).

V. **The Judges and Their Chronology:**

		YEARS.
3:8	Bondage to Cushan-rishathaim.....	8
3:11	Judgeship of Othniel.....	40
3:14	Bondage to Eglon.....	18
3:30	Peace with Ehud and Shamgar.....	80
4:3	Oppression by Jabni.....	20
5:31	Judgeship of Barak.....	40
6:1	Servitude to Midian and allies.....	7
8:28	Judgeship of Gideon.....	40
9:22	Rule of Abimelech.....	3
10:2	Judgeship of Tola.....	23
10:3	Judgeship of Jair.....	22
10:8	Oppression by Ammonites.....	18
12:7	Judgeship of Jephthah.....	6
12:9	Judgeship of Ibzan.....	7
12:11	Judgeship of Elon.....	10
12:14	Judgeship of Abdon.....	8
13:1	Bondage to Philistines.....	40
15:20 16:31	Judgeship of Samson.....	20
		410

If the forty years in the wilderness, the administration of Joshua, the forty years of Eli (I Sam. 4:18), the rule of Samuel, the reigns of Saul and David (the latter 40 years, I Kings 2:11) and four years of Solomon before the temple was built, are added, the total is much

more than the 480 years mentioned in I Kings 6:1 from the Exodus to the building of the temple. Herzfeld and others have attempted to harmonize by the theory that some of the periods mentioned in Judges were synchronous. Nöldeke has offered another hypothesis, that the 480 years of I Kings 6:1 omits according to Oriental custom the periods of bondage to the surrounding nations. The dates of the Exodus on the one hand and of Saul's reign on the other are so nearly fixed that the period of the Judges cannot have greatly exceeded two hundred years. The data is inadequate for a more exact chronology.

III

SAMUEL

I. **Name.** These two books were one among the Hebrews and named שְׁמוּאֵל not only because Samuel was the principal actor in the first part of the book but because he anointed Saul and David, the other principal actors. The name means "name of God." The Septuagint divided this book and named its parts together with the two books of Kings βίβλοι βασιλειῶν. Hence I and II Samuel were called the first and second Books of the Kingdoms. The Vulgate altered the title to Libri Regum, the Books of the Kings. The division of the books was first introduced into the Hebrew in the Rabbinical Bible of Daniel Bomberg in 1517. The English Bible has adopted a compromise, taking the division of the books from the Vulgate and Septuagint and the name from the Hebrew Bible. The authorized version adds to the title "otherwise called the First Book of the Kings" and "the Second Book of the Kings."

II. **Composition.** The Books of Samuel, like the earlier books, are considered by modern critics to be of composite origin and the result of one or more redactions. There is a difference of opinion concerning the identification of the sources. Cornill, Budde, and Schrader identify the older document with J of the Hexateuch and the younger with E. The majority of critics differ from them at this point. Stenning de-

scribes the origin of the books in this way: "The older narrative may be assigned approximately to the 9th century, while the later stratum of E (Budde's E1.), which, though old, yet treats the history from a more subjective standpoint, dates probably from the following century. . . . As in the Hexateuch and in Judges, these sources were combined and welded together by a later editor (Rje) who has however carried out his work in a less thorough manner. His work is in any case prior to the reforms of Josiah (621 B.C.) and to the influence of Deuteronomy, and must be placed in the 7th century. The present form of the Books of Samuel is largely due to an author of the Deuteronomic school whose hand may be clearly traced in the concluding summaries (I Sam. 14:47-51; II Sam. 8) and in various chronological notices (I Sam. 7:2; 13:1; II Sam. 2:10a, 11; 5:4-5)" (In Hasting's Bible Dictionary).

The *arguments for the partition of the books* of Samuel are similar to those used in the partition of the Hexateuch. They are classed by Smith under two heads.

1. "Duplication of certain incidents. Two denunciations of Eli's course are related, either one of which abundantly answers the author's purpose. There are two accounts of Saul's rejection and the second makes no allusion to the earlier. The two (or three) accounts of Saul's appointment as king are probably another example. Two accounts of David's coming to court have long given trouble to the harmonist. We have two sets of negotiations for Saul's daughter, the later being ignorant of the earlier one. There are at least two accounts of David's flight from court, two of his

having Saul in his power, two of his seeking refuge with Achish, two of the death of Saul.

2. Difference in style and point of view.

In one place Samuel appears as the theocratic ruler of the people, comparable to Moses, and to Moses alone, among the heroes of Israel. He administers the government as the representative of Yahweh. The whole people gather at his call, and he rebukes and commands with more than kingly authority. In another place, he is the seer of a small town, respected as one who blesses the sacrifice and presides at the local festival, but known only as a clairvoyant, whose information concerning lost or strayed property is reliable. Even thus he is unknown to Saul, whose home is only a few miles away. With this difference of view goes a difference of political theory. In one account Saul is chosen as king by God, is welcomed by Samuel, is assured that God is with him and encouraged to act as he finds opportunity. His election by God is an act of grace, for God has looked upon the affliction of His people, and now promises that Saul shall deliver them from the hand of the Philistines. But in other sections of the narrative the desire of the people for a king is an act of rebellion against Yahweh. Their act is an act of apostasy, parallel to all their rebellions of earlier times. No wonder; for to this narrator the Philistine oppression has already been relieved by Samuel. By spiritual weapons these enemies have been vanquished so that they come no more into the territory of Israel and even surrender the territory which they had taken away" (Commentary on Samuel pp. 15-16).

Answer.—The general arguments against this fallacious method of dividing the Hebrew literature have

been so fully given in the chapter on the Pentateuch, that they cannot be repeated in detail. The unity of the book is evidenced by the following considerations:

1. The orderly arrangements of the history. Events are not always given in chronological order. Nevertheless a clear and consistent plan is evident throughout. This plan could not have been the work of the two editors, unless they altered their sources and merged them into one beyond later recognition.

2. It is incredible that the editors could have allowed such evident repetitions to remain in the books. In their opinion, the alleged parallels and contradictions could not have been such. Even now respect for the intelligence of R requires us if possible to harmonize the accounts. In most cases this is easily done. Many of the parallels are accounts of different though similar events. Others are records of the same event from two different standpoints. Others still are not parallels at all but brief allusions to events already narrated which have special bearing on subsequent history.

3. Relation of the parts of the books to each other. Driver admits this: "Some of the narratives contained in I-II Samuel point forwards or backwards to one another, and are in other ways so connected together as to show that they are the work of one and the same writer" (p. 173).

4. The differences in point of view are not evidence of variety of authorship. It is altogether natural that Samuel was held in different esteem by different people and at different periods of his life, and it is according to God's dealings with His people in all times, that while their lack of faith in desiring a king is condemned,

God promises great things by that king, thus making the wrath of man to praise Him.

5. Uniform diction. There are certain expressions running all through the book which bind it into one. Of these Driver mentions among others "as thy soul liveth," "sons of Belial," "Jehovah of Hosts," "so may God do and more also," "from Dan even to Beer-sheba," "as Jehovah liveth," and "blessed be thou of Jehovah." His explanation, that "they appear to have formed part of the phraseology current at the time," is unsatisfactory. These and other expressions refute the contention of the critics that differences of style are discernible in the so-called parallel accounts.

III. **Author.** Concerning the authorship of the Books of Samuel we have very little internal or external testimony. The statement of I Sam. 27:6 ("Wherefore Ziklag pertaineth unto the kings of Judah unto this day") does not require a date after the separation of the northern kingdom. The distinction between Israel and Judah existed in David's time, for David reigned at first only over Judah and Ishbosheth over Israel (I Sam. 18:6; II Sam. 2:10; 24:1). The expression "unto this day" (I Sam. 27:6; 30:25) does not require a later date than the end of David's reign. The rabbinical tradition, that Samuel was the author, is opposed by the continuance of the history so far beyond the death of Samuel (I Sam. 25:1). The fact that David's death is not recorded, makes it probable that the books were written before it occurred, with the aid of older documents.

IV. **Purpose.** The Books of Samuel recount the establishment of the kingdom. They are very closely connected in the history of Samuel himself with the

book of Judges, for Samuel is called a judge (I Sam. 7:6, 15-17) as Eli, the high-priest, was before him (I Sam. 4:18). The times of Samuel before the anointing of Saul were times of the same religious apostasy and ignorance which prevailed in the days of the judges (I Sam. 2:12-17; 3:1, etc.).

Samuel was also a prophet (I Sam. 3:20). He was classed in the Old Testament with Moses and Aaron (Ps. 99:6; Jer. 15:1) and in the New Testament he is mentioned as the first of the prophets (Acts 3:24) and as the *terminus ad quem* of the time of the judges (Acts 13:20). His establishment of the schools of the prophets (I Sam. 19:20) at Ramah was followed by others at Bethel (II Kings 2:3), Jericho (II Kings 2:5) and Gilgal (II Kings 4:38). Thus the prophetic office grew up side by side with the kingly. Of both Samuel was the founder. Samuel was also the King-Maker. Because Saul's reign was only temporarily successful and because David's house were to be permanent rulers, no record of the establishment of the kingdom could stop short of the second reign. Samuel lived to anoint David but died before he came to the throne. David's reign however must be added to the story of regal establishment because he enlarged the borders of the land to its greatest extent, captured the stronghold of Zion, and made it his capital. Furthermore the promises of perpetual dominion to the house of David (II Sam. 7:12-16) became after his day the charter of the kingdom. David laid the foundations upon which all true kings of Israel built. With his death the story of establishment closes.

V. **Divisions.**

1. The Judgeship of Samuel I Sam 1-7.

a. The birth of Samuel and the song of Hannah 1:1 to 2:10.
b. The childhood and vision of Samuel 2:11 to 3:21.
c. The death of Eli. Chapter 4.
d. The ark in Philistia. Chapters 5-6.
e. The ark returned and the Philistines conquered. Chapter 7.

2. The Reign of Saul. I Sam. 8-31.
a. Israel desires a king. Chapter 8.
b. Saul chosen. Chapters 9-10.
c. Saul conquers Ammon. Chapter 11.
d. The address of Samuel. Chapter 12.
e. Saul's wars and rejection. Chapters 13-15.
f. David chosen. Chapter 16.
g. His prowess, friendship for Jonathan and the increasing hatred of Saul, Saul's death. Chapters 17-31.

3. The Reign of David. II Sam. 1-24.
a. David's mourning for Saul and Jonathan. Chapter 1.
b. David's establishment as King. Chapters 2-5.
c. David's purpose to build the temple and its refusal. Chapters 6-7.
d. His victories and kindness to Mephibosheth. Chapters 8-10.
e. David's sin and marriage. The birth of Solomon. Chapters 11-12.
f. Absalom's vengeance upon Ammon. Absalom's rebellion. Chapters 13-19.
g. Sheba's rebellion; David's song and last words; his sin in numbering Israel. Chapters 20-24.

IV

KINGS

I. Name. In the Hebrew Bible these two were originally one book, called סֵפֶר מְלָכִים or simply מְלָכִים In modern Hebrew Bibles, since the Rabbinic Bible of Daniel Bomberg (Venice 1516-7), the division is introduced. The Septuagint classes them with I and II Samuel under the names *Βασιλειῶν τρίτη* and *τετάρτη*. This method is adopted in the Vulgate (Liber Regum tertius and quartus). The authorized version has the title, "The First Book of the Kings commonly called the Third Book of the Kings," and "The Second Book of the Kings, commonly called the Fourth Book of the Kings." The American Revised Version drops these secondary titles.

II. Composition. The Books of Kings refer to three different sources for further information:

1. The Book of the Acts of Solomon. I Kings 11:41.
2. The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel (17 times).
3. The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah (15 times).

These books were probably official contemporary records. Mention is frequently made of an officer of the court called a מַזְכִּיר recorder or remembrancer (II Sam. 8:16; 20:24; I Kings 4:3; II Kings 18:18, 37; II Chron. 34:8). His duties probably were to record the important events of the reign, as was done also at

the Persian court (Ezra 4:15; 6:2; Esther 2:23; 6:1). These and other similar books are mentioned as sources of the Books of Chronicles (II Chron. 9:29; 12:15; 13:22; 20:34). We know that one of these official records was afterwards "inserted in the book of the Kings of Israel" (II Chron. 20:34). It is probable that the books referred to by the author of Kings were such collections of royal records. The author was merely an editor or compiler who brought together all this material, adding to it comments of his own.

Many critics think that the compiler also used other unnamed sources. He epitomized the character and reign of the kings by certain formulas such as "He did that which was evil [or that which was good] in the eyes of Jehovah." It is worthy of comment that an unfavorable verdict is passed upon all the kings of Israel.

Cornill, Burney and others distinguish three redactions of the book.

1. The first and principal redactor who wrote in the spirit of the so-called Deuteronomic reform about 600 B.C. This date is determined by the use of the expression "unto this day" indicating a time before the Exile (I Kings 8:8; 9:21; 12:19; II Kings 8:22; 16:6). This redactor is said to have added the framework of the history. He is the real editor of the books and his existence is admitted even by conservative scholars, though his Deuteronomic character is denied. He is called Rd1.

2. Certain additions are said to have been made during the Exile. The most important of these are II Kings 24:10 to 25:30 and presumably II Kings 23:31 to 24:9. The date is determined by the release

of Jehoiachin, king of Judah, by Evil-Merodach in the 37th year after the reign of the former, viz., 561 B.C. (II Kings 25:27). The writer however apparently wrote II Kings 25:30 after the death of Jehoiachin of which the date is unknown. On the other hand it is asserted by the critics that the entire absence of any hope of return from exile in these books, shows that this editor must have done his work before the decree of Cyrus in 536 B.C. This is Rd2.

3. The variations between the Massoretic Text and that of the Septuagint are said to indicate the work of later editors who transposed certain sections and inserted additions after the recension, from which the Septuagint was made, was separated from that which lies at the basis of the Massoretic Text. This final editorial work is assigned by Cornill to the third century B.C.

Answer.—Concerning these critical opinions, it is necessary to separate the proven from the unproven. The assumption of a redaction in the third century is altogether unwarranted as the considerations of the relation of the Massoretic Text and the Septuagint has shown (see Chapter on the Text). The marks of the time before the Exile indicate that the body of the book was compiled at that time, and the marks of exilic date are evidence of a later addition, which need not have extended to the main portion of the book. The book, as we now have it, was complete in the last half of the Exile and is based upon contemporaneous records.

III. **Author.** Who the editor was, there is no means of determining. Driver says: "The compiler of Kings though not probably (as has sometimes been supposed), Jeremiah himself, was nevertheless a man like-minded

with Jeremiah and almost certainly a contemporary who lived and wrote under the same influences. Deuteronomy is the standard by which the compiler judges both men and actions; and the history from the beginning of Solomon's reign, is presented not in purely objective form, but from the point of view of the Deuteronomic code" (p. 199). According to the Talmud Jeremiah was the author. The fact that Jeremiah was carried into Egypt however precludes the possibility of his having written the story of the deportation and imprisonment of Jehoiachin in Babylon. The date of the author and his prophetic standpoint are reasonably clear but his identity remains unknown.

IV. **Purpose.** These books are intimately related to the two books of Samuel with which they are numbered in the Septuagint. They take up the royal and prophetic history where Samuel laid it down and carry it forward in the same spirit. The books of Kings trace the history of the united kingdom from Solomon's accession and of the divided kingdom until its two parts were conquered by Assyria and Babylon. This period is over four centuries and its *terminus ad quem* is the release of Jehoiachin by Evil-Merodach in 561 B.C. These are the only books recording the entire political history of Israel, for Chronicles not only gives no record of the Northern Kingdom, but seems to avoid reference to it. In all the history the kings of Judah are judged according to the standard of David's obedience (I Kings 3:3; 11:4, 6; 14:8; 15:3, 11; II Kings 14:3; 16:2; 18:3; 22:2) and the kings of Israel according to the standard of Jeroboam's sin (I Kings 15:34; 16:2, 7, 19, 26, 31; 22:52; II Kings 3:3; 10:29, 31; 13:2, 6, 11; 14:24; 15:9, 18, 24, 28; 17:22-23). Thus the

history of the two kingdoms presents the two great moral lessons: (1) Conformity to the noble standard set by the fathers, brings peace and prosperity. The Kingdom of Judah was finally overthrown because of its neglect of the high standard set by David. (2) Apostasy from the people of God is the fruitful cause of many generations of continued sinfulness. All later sins are traced back to that of Jeroboam (II Kings 17:22-23).

The division between the two books is in the middle of the reign of Ahaziah and seems to have no special significance. It is near the middle of the entire book and therefore a convenient dividing place. One purpose runs through both parts.

The great prominence given to the work of the prophets Elijah and Elisha in the Northern Kingdom is also similar to the spirit of the author of Samuel, who had recounted Samuel's activity in founding the schools of the prophets. This as well as the mention of Isaiah and Jeremiah indicates the prophetic standpoint of the writer. The standpoint of the books of Chronicles being priestly, the Northern Kingdom is passed by and with it the story of Elijah and Elisha.

V. **Table of the Kings.** The following dates agree with the well-established dates of the destruction of Jerusalem (586 B.C.) and of the fall of Samaria (722 B.C.). The other dates, derived from Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions vary somewhat from these, but with the possibility of error in fitting them to the Bible numbers, as well as the possible errors in transmission of the Bible numbers, greater accuracy is not attainable.

Judah.		*Israel.*	
Saul	1099-1059		
David	1059-1019		
Solomon	1019- 979		
Rehoboam	979- 962	Jeroboam I	979-957
Abijah	962- 959		
Asa	959- 918	Nadab	957-955
		Baasha	955-932
		Zimri	932
		Tibni	932-928
		Omri	928-922
Jehoshaphat	918-893	Ahab	922-900
		Ahaziah	900-898
Jehoram	893-885	Joram	898-886
Ahaziah	885	Jehu	886-858
Athaliah	885-879		
Jehoash	879-839	Jehoahaz	858-841
Amaziah	839-810	Jehoash	841-825
Azariah	810-758	Jeroboam II	825-784
		(Interregnum.	784-772)
		Zachariah	772
		Shallum	771
		Menahem	771-761
		Pekahiah	761-759
Jotham	758-742	Pekah	759-739
Ahaz	742-726	(Interregnum.	739-730)
Hezekiah	726-697	Hoshea	730-721
		Fall of Samaria	722
Manasseh	697-642		
Amon	642-640		
Josiah	640-609		
Jehoahaz	609-608		

Judah.

Jehoiakim..... 608-597
Jehoiachin..... 597
Zedekiah..... 597-586
Destruction of Jerusalem.... 586

VI. **Divisions.**

1. The Reign of Solomon over the united Kingdom. I Kings 1-11.
   - *a.* His anointing. Chapter 1.
   - *b.* The death of David. Chapter 2.
   - *c.* Solomon's marriage and choice of wisdom. Chapter 3.
   - *d.* His resources and alliance with Hiram. Chapters 4-5.
   - *e.* The building and dedication of the temple. Chapters 6-8.
   - *f.* Solomon's greatness, wisdom and apostasy. Chapters 9-11.

2. History of the divided Kingdom till the captivity of Israel. I Kings 12 to II Kings 17.

Special prominence is given in this section to the work of the prophets Elijah and Elisha.

3. History of the kingdom of Judah till the Exile II Kings 18-25.

Section II. The Latter Prophets

Preliminary: Hebrew Prophecy

I. Names. The Old Testament prophets receive several different names:

1. Man of God (I Sam. 9:6; I Kings 12:22; 17:18; II Kings 4). This name emphasizes his choice by God, his obedience to God, and his special fellowship with God.

2. Servant of Jehovah. This title is applied to others than prophets and is too general to indicate the special work of the prophet, except as one of those who faithfully carry out God's will upon the earth (I Kings 14:18).

3. Messenger of Jehovah (Is. 42:19; Mal. 3:1). This is more specific and implies that like the angels, the prophets were sent on the behests of God to do His work. It also suggests the idea of interpreting God's will to His people.

4. Seer. This name is found in two forms, רֹאֶה and חֹזֶה. Of these the former, derived from the usual verb, "to see," is less common. The latter verb is never used of merely physical seeing. Both these words view the prophet as a man of special insight, capable of seeing the true meaning of things both present and future. The full significance of these words, however, requires the reception of occasional divinely sent visions, which the prophet was to pass on to the people. The name, seer, (רֹאֶה) was older than the name prophet (I Sam. 9:9).

5. Prophet. This most common name has the form נָבִיא. Its origin is somewhat doubtful. It has been commonly considered a weakened form of נָבַע (Prov. 18:4) to bubble up, to gush forth. Hence נָבִיא is a man who is filled, inspired, in an ecstasy with the message he has to give. The root in Arabic means to be prominent and in the causative, to bring into prominence, to announce. In Assyrian "nabu" means to announce, and Nebo is the Mercury, the interpreter of the Gods. Hence a prophet is properly one who announces God's will, who speaks for and from God.

II. **Function.** Prophecy was a necessary element in the conception of the chosen people. "The Jewish people were merely the point of union, merely the elevated conducting rod, so to speak, pointing to heaven and drawing down an influence to be distributed speedily over the whole earth" (Davidson—Old Testament Prophecy p. 3). The prophets, following this figure, were the highest point of this conducting rod through which God's will was imparted to Israel and thus to all mankind. The prophetic office in a sense, belonged to all the people in proportion to their realization of the ideal of Israel. Yet from time to time God called certain men to be the special instruments for transmitting His will. Since the duties of the prophets were occasional, the office was never hereditary, like the priesthood, and there are long gaps in the history of prophecy.

The prophet was an intense believer in the immanence of God, which made all history to be God's working out of His eternal purpose. To proclaim this view of human affairs and especially of Israel's affairs was his

divine office. Hence prophecy bore a peculiar relation to the three divisions of time.

1. The Past. The prophets viewed history from the religious and moral standpoint. The dealings of God in times past were a fruitful source of lessons for the present. The prophets were interpreters of history, focusing its light upon the problems of the present. Hence the so-called, "Former Prophets" (Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings) are historical books written by prophets. They are not complete annals of events but rather "history with a moral."

2. The Present. It is with the present that prophecy has chiefly to do. History and prediction are both made subservient to the present. The past is described and the future foretold only that the problems of the present may be solved. The prophets were religious reformers in times of apostasy and preachers of righteousness in times of prosperity. With all human and divine aid they addressed themselves to the conditions before them. Their predictions as well as their precepts have their application for the present. Hence history and prophecy developed side by side in Israel, the latter the inspired commentary upon the former.

3. The Future. Prediction forms only a small part of prophecy. It was not the most essential thing. Prophets are condemned, even when their predictions are fulfilled, if they counsel the people to worship other Gods (Deut. 13:1-5). The moral and religious are the essentials of prophecy. And yet the ability to foretell the future is an important element as Davidson explains: "If history be a moral process, it will have a goal which is also moral, and which will at last realize perfectly its principles, seen to be imperfectly realized

now. Thus arises an eschatology which proclaims that in the last days there shall be established a universal kingdom which will be a perfect kingdom of God upon the earth, being an everlasting righteousness" (p. 72). Yet future events are usually described as if present, so strong are the bonds which unite the prophet to his own time.

III. **History.** The development of prophecy was in several different epochs.

1. Before Moses. Prophecy began with the protevangelium in Eden. Enoch foretold the coming of the Lord with ten thousand of his saints (Jude 14). Noah prophesied of the flood and afterwards of the destinies of his descendants. Abraham was a prophet of the blessing upon his seed and Jacob foretold the destinies of the twelve patriarchs. Joseph's dreams were also prophetic. In all this epoch prophecy was almost exclusively predictive and preparatory. It had not yet attained its full development.

2. From Moses to Samuel. Moses gave an entirely new idea to prophecy. His work was almost exclusively didactic. Prediction is scarcely found. Yet he was the greatest Old Testament prophet in the scriptural sense of the word. He was the founder of prophecy and all later prophets of the Old Covenant were interpreters and followers of Moses. In intimacy of fellowship with God he surpassed them all (Num. 12:6-8; Deut. 34:10). Only Christ himself transcended Moses as a prophet. From the time of Moses to Samuel the voice of prophecy was rarely heard (Judges 6:8).

3. From Samuel till the prophetic writers. Samuel gave a new impulse to prophecy which was never lost so long as inspiration continued. He may be

called the founder of the prophetic office as an essential part of the kingdom which took shape in his day. Prophets like Nathan and Gad belonged to the court of the king. In this period and even later the prophets were like the Nazirites, separated unto the Lord (I Sam. 1:11; 3:20; Amos 2:11). Many of them were united with the sanctuaries at Ramah, Bethel, Gibeah, Gilgal, and Jericho and, like Jeremiah and Ezekiel, were probably of priestly families. They were numerous (I Kings 18:4).

The so-called *schools of the prophets* were associations or brotherhoods of pious men for mutual edification. Such existed in the time of Elisha at Bethel, Jericho and Gilgal (II Kings 2:3, 5; 4:38). These associations probably reduced prophecy to a profession with its official garb and its cant phrases (Jer. 23:33-40; Zech. 13:4). The hairy garment was worn in imitation of Elijah (II Kings 1:8) whose prophetic work in the northern kingdom like that of Elisha was the model of all later prophets. His burning zeal for righteousness and his fearlessness are unsurpassed in sacred history. Ecstasy was often a characteristic of prophecy in this period and helped to bring the office of prophet into disrepute (I Sam. 10:10; 19:24). Mechanical means were used to induce ecstasy (I Sam. 10:5; II Kings 3:15). Thus far the prophets were preachers but not writers.

4. The canonical writers protested against the formalism or open idolatry of their day and by committing their words to writing, perpetuated prophecy in its most developed form. The order of these prophets is a matter of criticism which will develop in the chapters concerning them.

The following list is presented for reference:

1. Before the Exile.			Contemporary Prophets.
Joel.....	875-865	B.C.	
Jonah....	825-784	"	Amos.
Amos....	795-785	"	Jonah.
Hosea....	785-725	"	Isaiah, Micah and Obadiah.
Isaiah...	758-697	"	Hosea, Micah and Obadiah.
Micah...	745-700	"	Hosea, Isaiah and Obadiah.
Obadiah..	742-726	"	Hosea, Isaiah and Micah.
Jeremiah.	627-586	"	Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk and Ezekiel
Zephaniah	626-621	"	Jeremiah and Nahum.
Nahum..	623	"	Jeremiah and Zephaniah.
Habakkuk	608-600	"	Jeremiah.
2. During the Exile.			
Ezekiel..	592-570	"	Jeremiah.
3. After the Exile.			
Haggai..	520	"	Zechariah.
Zechariah	520-475	"	Haggai.
Malachi..	433	"	

5. After the close of the Old Testament canon, prophecy was again silent until John the Baptist. He was of a similar spirit to Elijah and the greatest prophet of the old dispensation, standing on the threshold of the new (Matt. 11:9; Luke 1:76; 7:26). His greatness is however lost in that of Him whose shoe-latchet he was not worthy to unloose. Christ was the prophet par excellence, in whom all prophecy finds its climax and fulfilment. He is at once the purpose and the result of Hebrew prophecy.

IV. **Style.** The prophetic office and inspiration did

not destroy or replace the individuality of the prophets. The prophets were not automatons nor their inspiration mechanical. Though altogether supernatural their inspiration had a psychological basis. Their dreams and visions were sent from God for a definite purpose but follow the laws of dreams. God spoke in them in a manner superior to that in which He speaks in men to-day, yet not contrary to their own psychological processes. The prophets were geniuses but mere genius did not constitute prophecy. Ecstasy was characteristic of some prophets but others, and those the greatest (Moses and Christ), were calm and meditative. Fairbairn finds three marks of the prophetic style and diction:

"1. Poetical elevation.

"2. Figurative representation.

"3. The exhibition of events as present, or successive only in relation to each other rather than as linked to definite historical epochs" (Fairbairn on Prophecy p. 13).

The literary style of prophecy is between prose and poetry, sometimes rising to the exalted parallelism of Hebrew poetry and then descending to the dignified simplicity of Hebrew prose. Davidson has described the lack of perspective in prediction in this way: "Just as a traveller at a distance from a mountainous region, sees one mountain rise up behind another, and fancies it close at the back of the nearer, but when he reaches the nearer, finds that the one which seemed so close behind it has receded, and really stands far away; so in the prophetic view, great events crowd up close behind one another, which however in actual fulfilment are widely apart in time" (p. 353).

V. **Messianic Prophecy.** The Messiah and his Kingdom are the central subject of all predictive prophecy, the background of every oracle concerning the future. In regard to each Messianic prophecy two things are to be distinguished, what the author meant and what the Spirit of Revelation meant. In proportion to the relation of these two elements we have three kinds of Messianic prediction.

1. Direct prediction. Here the prophet clearly saw the coming Christ. The Spirit and the prophet have the same meaning. Such are for example Ps. 110 and Isa. 7.

2. Indirect or typical prediction. Here the prophet had a primary reference, sometimes realizing but little of its typical character. The Spirit of Revelation pointed beyond to the ideal fulfilment. This is the most common form of Messianic prophecy which refers primarily to the offices of prophet, priest and king and to the characters of Son of God, Servant of God and Righteous Sufferer.

3. Generally Messianic. Such are the statements of general truths, whose supreme application is only to Christ, although the author meant nothing more than a delineation of the ideal. Examples of this are found in Psalms 8 and 85.

All Messianic prediction presents two converging lines, the human and the divine. "Along one of these God descends and displays Himself and comes near to men, until He becomes man. Along the other, man is raised up and enlightened and purified until he is capable of receiving God" (Davidson pp. 12-13). As the sky and the earth meet at the horizon, so both these lines meet in the God-man, Christ Jesus.

I

ISAIAH

I. **Name.** The book is named from the prophet, its author. The name has the form יְשַׁעְיָה in the title of the Hebrew Bible, but the longer form יְשַׁעְיָהוּ in the text. It means "Jehovah is salvation." The Greek form is *Ἡσαΐας* and the Latin either Esaias or Isaias. The English name is a transliteration of the shorter Hebrew form.

II. **Composition.**

1. *Critical Position.* According to the dominant critical opinion of to-day, the book contains much which was not the work of Isaiah nor of his time. Chapters 40-66 are said to have been composed toward the close of the Exile (about 545-536 B.C.) by an unknown writer, who is called for convenience the Deutero-Isaiah. In contrast, the true prophet is sometimes designated the Proto-Isaiah. Chapters 36-39 are considered a historical appendix, written a few years after the death of Isaiah. Chapters 13:1 to 14:23; 21:1-10; 24 to 27; and 34-35 are also assigned to an exilic date. Some of the more radical critics deny the genuineness of Isa. 2:2-4; 11:10 through chap. 12; 14:24-27; 17:12-14; 19:16-25; 23; and 32-33. They assign late post-exilic dates to many of these sections and assert that the first book of Isaiah received its present form by redactional activity later still, the redactor transposing the writings of the real Isaiah from the true chronological order and inserting these other fragments.

The literary unity of chapters 40-66 is denied by many. Dillmann assigned chapters 40-48 to the time of Cyrus' successes (545 B.C.) 49-62 to B.C. 545-539 and 63-66 to the period just before the decree of Cyrus permitting the return of the exiles (536 B.C.). Duhm and Cheyne are much more radical. The former confines the work of the Deutero-Isaiah to chaps. 40-55 although these chapters are said to contain many later insertions. The most important are the "servant" passages (42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13 to 53:12) which he refers to B.C. 500-450. Chapters 56-66 Duhm refers to a writer approaching the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, whom he calls the Trito-Isaiah. Cheyne agrees with Duhm in the main, though he assigns the "servant" passages to the Second Isaiah and considers chaps. 56-66 to have been the work of a school of writers rather than an individual.

2. *Critical Arguments.* The same general arguments which are used to prove chaps. 40-66 non-Isaianic are applied to the other disputed sections. These arguments are three.

a. The theme of Chapters 40-66 is the Exile and the return. It is not predicted but presupposed. The people whom the prophet addresses are the exiles. The critics assert that though there are cases of prophets projecting themselves into the future, no other instance of such prolonged maintaining of an ideal future standpoint is known, as this would be if Isaiah wrote it 120 years before the Exile. The mention of Cyrus by name so long before his time (Isa. 44:28; 45:1) is also said to be contrary to the usual method of prophecy.

b. The literary style of these chapters differs greatly from that of the earlier portion of the book. Several

words and expressions, frequent in these chapters are never or rarely found in the remainder of the book. Cheyne cites other expressions which indicate a date later than Isaiah. The grandeur of style, characteristic of Isaiah, is here replaced by pathos. Personification is a common figure with the writer of chapters 40-66.

c. The theological ideas are said to be different from those of Isaiah. The writer emphasizes the infinitude of God. The Isaianic doctrine of the preservation of the faithful remnant is wanting in the second Isaiah, as well as the figure of the Messianic king. The relation of Jehovah to the nations is much more fully developed than by Isaiah.

3. *Answer to Critical arguments.*

a. It is admitted that the standpoint of the writer of chapters 40-66 is the Exile but it is insisted that this is an ideal and not a real standpoint. Isaiah projects himself into the time of the Exile by the Spirit of Revelation. If evangelical critics admit that there are other instances in the prophets of such projection into the future (Driver p. 237), it is difficult to understand why so great a prophet as Isaiah might not have maintained this ideal standpoint throughout so long a section.

b. The maintenance of this position in the Exile was made easier by the fact that the Exile was not an event still future to Isaiah but a process which had begun before his time and whose culmination was a commonplace of the prophets. It was needless for Isaiah to repeat this prediction in chapters 40-66, for he had already foretold the Exile (Isa. 5:5-6; 10:20-24; 32; 13-18) and all the people of Isaiah's time were familiar with the idea. Furthermore this process of the Exile

had two notable confirmations in Isaiah's time, the destruction of the northern kingdom and the invasion of the southern kingdom by Sennacherib. Isaiah's prophecy of return refers not merely to the two southern tribes who still held out against the enemy, but also to the ten northern tribes who were already in exile. When Isaiah had seen Samaria captured and her people deported, Jerusalem besieged and her king "shut up like a bird in a cage," and Sennacherib's hosts driven back only by divine intervention and when in his old age he saw the profligacy and idolatry of the reign of Manasseh, which must inevitably hasten the coming doom, what wonder that he considered the Exile already begun and devoted his closing years to a description of the glorious future which awaited the people after the return. As was usual with the prophets, he did not realize that a century and more would intervene. The reforms of Josiah which delayed the Exile were not present to his sight. These words of consolation which were appropriate for the believers in the beginning of Manasseh's reign, because they saw the Exile at hand, would be appropriate to those actually in exile.

c. It is also admitted that names and dates are not usual in prophecy. Yet the mention of Cyrus by name 150 years in advance is not without precedent. Josiah was foretold by name in the reign of Jeroboam (I Kings 13:1-2), over three hundred years before his time. Bethlehem is mentioned by name as the birth-place of the Messiah by Isaiah's contemporary Micah (5:2) and that so clearly that Christ was expected to be born there (Matt. 2:4-6) and some objected to Jesus because he came from Galilee (Jno. 7:40-44). Other exact prophecies are the 70 years of exile by Jeremiah (Jer.

25:11-12; 29:10; Dan. 9:2), Daniel's mention of Christ (Dan. 9:24-26), Zechariah's of the piercing of the Shepherd (12:10) and of his being sold for thirty pieces of silver (11:13) and Ezekiel's and Zechariah's against Tyre (Ezek. 26-27; Zech. 9:1-8).

These passages are sufficient to show that in unusual cases and as a special proof of divine revelation, the prophets sometimes mention names and dates in the future. Such unusual conditions obtained when Isaiah wrote these closing chapters. With the Exile impending, the faithful needed some special proof for the prophet's assurance of return. This he gave them in the man Cyrus whose rising, those then living might witness, for all Isaiah knew. At any rate expectation of Cyrus would be the comfort of intervening years, and when he should actually arise, Israel would know that their redemption drew nigh.

d. The differences of style between chapters 40-66 and the earlier parts of the book are not sufficient to indicate a difference in authorship. Isaiah prophesied during forty years or more. A considerable lapse of time may partially account for his changed style. It is more fully explained however by the change of subject in chapters 40-66 and especially by the ideal standpoint from which they are written. The grandeur of the earlier chapters gives place to pathos because the aged prophet seeks to console those who foresee the destruction of their land.

The literary argument is of little value, by itself. Whence do we know the style of Isaiah if not from the book which bears his name? To derive our knowledge of his style from a part of that book on the presumption that he wrote it and then to deny his authorship for the remainder of the book, is reasoning in a circle.

e. On the other hand the critics are compelled to admit that the second Isaiah exhibits many signs of similarity to the first. To account for this some have conjectured that he was a disciple of Isaiah, others that he was filled with the spirit of Isaiah or wrote in conscious imitation of that prophet. It was this similarity to Isaiah, the critics tell us, which caused the editor to add these chapters to the true work of Isaiah. If the similarity is so great, the differences are not sufficient to require another author. Instead of emphasizing the differences and then attempting to explain the resemblances, it is simpler and more logical to emphasize the resemblances and explain the differences. These glorious chapters were not written in the Exile in the spirit of Isaiah, but by Isaiah in the spirit of the Exile. Their similarity to Isaiah's acknowledged work is evidence that he wrote them. The differences are because he wrote on another subject and from another viewpoint.

The resemblances are of two kinds:

(1) Verbal agreement.

40:5 58:14	compare	1:20
43:13	"	14:27
45:11 60:21	"	19:25 29:23
51:11	"	35:10
56:8	"	11:12
61:2 63:4	"	34:8
65:25	"	11:9

(2) Similar thought or figure.

40:3-4 49:11	compare	35:8-10
41:17-18 43:19	"	35:6-7
42:1 61:1	"	11:2
42:7	"	9:2
42:13	"	31:4
42:18-20 43:8	"	6:9
43:13	"	14:27
43:24	"	1:14
43:26	"	1:14-19
45:9 64:9	"	29:16
45:15 57:17	"	8:17
47:3	"	3:17 20:4
47:10	"	29:15 30:1
49:2	"	11:4
49:26	"	9:20
51:4	"	2:3
51:9	"	27:1
53:1	"	6:9-12
53:2	"	11:1, 10
54:7-8	"	26:20
55:12	"	14:8 32:15 35:1-2

56:7	compare	2:2
56:12	"	22:13
59:3	"	1:15
59:11	"	38:14
60:13	"	35:2
60:18	"	26:1
60:21	"	11:1
61:8	"	1:11, 13
62:10	"	11:12
63:17	"	6:10
65:3 / 66:17	"	1:29
65:19	"	35:10
65:25	"	11:6
66:16	"	27:1

f. The differences in theological ideas are to be accounted for in the same way as the differences in style. It is not claimed that the theological ideas are contradictory to those of Isaiah but that they are broader and more elevated. This breadth and elevation are due to the lofty subject of which he was speaking. Like John on Patmos, he saw things yet to come and so widespread was his vision of the future that his theological ideas were broadened. Therefore he spoke of the infinitude of God. The very same Messiah who had appeared before to him as a King of David's time, now appears as the "Servant of Jehovah" and the Righteous Sufferer. Yet the reference to David (55:3) shows that the former conception is not entirely forgotten. The absence of the idea of the preservation of the faithful remnant and the broader conception of the relation of Jehovah to the nations are due to the ideal standpoint

of these chapters. Indeed the theological ideas of the second Isaiah are not different from those of his contemporary, Micah. The same glorious prophecy of the future, the same broad conception of the nations, and the confident expectation of return from the Exile are characteristic of them both.

g. Literary resemblance with Micah.

Micah 1:11.....	compare.....	Isa. 47:2-3
" 2:13.....	"	" 52:12
" 3:5	"	" 56:10-11
" 3:8	"	" 58:1
" 3:11.....	"	" 48:2
" 4:13.....	"	" 41:15-16
" 7:17.....	"	" 49:23

4. *Critical Arguments concerning Isa.* 36-39.

Strack presents two arguments against the Isaianic authorship of chapters 36-39.

a. Sennacherib's death is mentioned (Isa. 37:37-38) an event which is dated 682 B.C. and after Isaiah's time.

b. These chapters agree almost word for word with II Kings 18:13, 17 to 20:19 and were taken from it.

Answer.—a. It is possible that the mention of Sennacherib's death was a later addition from the book of Kings. If however we suppose that Isaiah was 20 years old "in the year that King Uzziah died" (according to the critics 737 B.C.) when his ministry began, we have only to imagine him living to be eighty in order to record Sennacherib's death. The likelihood that Isaiah lived so long is strengthened by the tradition

that he suffered death by martyrdom in the reign of Manasseh, who came to the throne according to Strack's estimate, in 686 B.C. only four years before the death of Sennacherib. Such a supposition would also account for the tone of chapters 40-66. They reflect a time of idolatry such as existed in Judah in the reign of Manasseh.

b. The resemblance of Isa. 36-39 to II Kings 18:13, 17 to 20:19, whatever its explanation, need not militate against the Isaianic authorship. The Books of Kings rest upon older records of the individual reigns, therefore the book was not necessarily complete when the passages in Isaiah were taken from it. Isaiah may have taken Isa. 36-39 in the main from the regal annals of his time, which later constituted a part of the Books of Kings. On the other hand, the brevity of the account of Hezekiah's sickness in Isa. 38:1-8 as compared with that of II Kings 20:1-11 seems to indicate that Isaiah's record is the original. Isaiah does not mention the lump of figs with which Hezekiah was healed and only casually alludes to the two choices of Hezekiah but gives Hezekiah's Psalm (Isa. 38:10-20) which is not found in Kings. Thus Isaiah was either the author of chapters 36-39 or incorporated them in his book.

5. *Other Evidences of Unity.*

a. The last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah are admitted to be the most exalted and remarkable literary production of any prophet of Israel. It is exceedingly improbable that the name of this incomparable prophet should be entirely forgotten, that his work should become a mere appendix to that of an inferior prophet, and that for twenty centuries his work should be universally regarded among the Jews as that of the inferior

prophet. It is even more improbable that sections of a later time should be intermingled with the writings of Isaiah by a bungling editor, so that it has become very difficult to extricate the true work of that prophet and arrange it in chronological order. It is incredible that the Jews with their superstitious adoration for their sacred records would have allowed them to be confused and mutilated in this manner.

b. The inspired New Testament saints and writers quote these chapters as the work of Isaiah—John the Baptist (Matt. 3:3; Luke 3:4; Jno. 1:23); Matthew (Matt. 8:1; 12:18-21); John (Jno. 12:38) and Paul (Rom. 10:16, 20-21). Though our Lord nowhere quotes the Deutero-Isaiah as the writing of Isaiah, yet he tacitly assumed its genuineness when, without correcting the popular misapprehension, he read from it in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke 4:16-19).

c. The writer of chapters 40-66 does not show the familiarity with the land or religion of Babylon which we would expect from a man living among the captives. In this respect his work differs radically from that of Ezekiel, the true prophet of the Exile, and even from Jeremiah who witnessed the beginning of the Exile. This ignorance of detail shows that the prophet's standpoint among the captives is ideal rather than real.

d. There are many passages in the Deutero-Isaiah which do not fit the time of the Exile but do fit Isaiah's time. Such are Isa. 40:2, 9; 43:6; 44:9-20; 48:1, 5; 49:25; 51:7; 56:3 etc.; 57:13-21; 58:1, 6-7; 59:1-8; 60:4, 6-7; 65:2-7.

III. **Author.** The author of the entire book was Isaiah, the son of Amoz, who lived and wrought in Jerusalem. He was ordained a prophet in the year that

King Uzziah died (B.C. 758) * and continued his ministry in the reigns of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah. Hosea and Micah were his contemporary prophets. The date of Isaiah's death is not certainly known. There was however a Jewish tradition in the second century A.D. that he suffered martyrdom by being sawn asunder in the persecutions after the accession of Manasseh. If so his ministry extended over about 60 years. He seems to have been specially influential with Hezekiah. In II Chron. 26:22 Isaiah is said to have written a vision of Uzziah's reign and in II Chron. 32:32 he is said to have had a "Vision" which contained a history of Hezekiah and which is found in "the book of the Kings of Judah and Israel." We do not however possess this book, at least in the form including Isaiah's "Vision."

Concerning his private life we know that Isaiah was married (Isa. 8:3) and that he had two sons to whom symbolic names were given. The first was called Shear-jashub (7:3) meaning "a remnant shall return" and the second Maher-shalal-hash-baz meaning "spoil quickly, plunder swiftly."

IV. **Theme.** Isaiah's work had to do chiefly with Judah and Jerusalem at a very critical period of their history. The rising power of Assyria and the waning power of Egypt caused the presence in Judah of two political parties, the one favoring a defensive alliance with Assyria and the other with Egypt. The prophet stood between these two, forbade all human alliances and urged the people to trust in Jehovah of Hosts.

*Others date Uzziah's death 737 B.C., and Manasseh's accession 686 B.C. If so, Isaiah's ministry may be dated 737-680 B.C., thus surviving Sennacherib (See p. 193).

Isaiah had a very lofty conception of God. He speaks more than any other Old Testament writer of the holiness of God and emphasizes His infinitude and spirituality. The prophet had a broad view of the relation of God to man. He gave prophecies concerning Syria, Moab, Egypt, Tyre, Assyria and Babylon not only because of their relation to Judah but as the creatures of God. He recognized the universality of Jehovah's dominion. Like the other prophets, he demanded spirituality in worship, not the mere performance of sacrifices and vows but the heart's devotion to God. His conception of the glorious future is brighter and more varied than that of any other prophet of the Old Testament and the Messianic ideas of Isaiah transcend those of the other Old Testament writers. A large part of his prophecies probably group themselves about the two great crises of Judah in his time, the first, when Israel and Syria made a confederacy against Judah in the days of Ahaz and the second, when Judah was invaded by Sennacherib in the reign of Hezekiah.

V. **Divisions.**

Introduction. Chapter 1.

1. Prophecies from Isaiah's Real Standpoint. Chaps. 2-35.

a. Prophecy against Judah and Jerusalem. Chapters 2-5.

b. The Book of Immanuel, opening with an account of Isaiah's ordination. Chapters 6-12.

c. Ten judgments upon the nations. Chapters 13-24.

d. Praise to Jehovah. His promises and warnings for Judah. Chapters 25-35.

Historical section concerning the invasion of Sennacherib, which is supplementary to the first part of the book and introductory to the last part. Chapters 36-39.

2. Prophecies from the Ideal Standpoint of the Exile. Chapters 40-66.

a. Jehovah the Saviour of Israel. Chapters 40-48.

b. Jehovah the Saviour of the Gentiles. Chapters 49-57.

c. The Glorious Future of God's people. Chapters 58-66.

II

JEREMIAH

I. Name. The name of the book is that of the prophet. It has two forms יִרְמְיָהוּ and יִרְמְיָה. Its probable meaning is "whom Jehovah appoints or establishes." The Greek form is Ἰερεμίας, and the Latin Jeremias. The English name comes from the shorter Hebrew form.

II. Composition.

1. *Evidence from the Book.* Jeremiah dictated to Baruch, his scribe, all his prophecies from the beginning of his ministry to the fourth year of Jehoiakim (Jer. 36:1-4). This would cover 23 of the 41 years of Jeremiah's ministry. In the following year this roll was cut and thrown into the fire by the king, after he heard it read. (Jer. 36:23.) Accordingly the prophet prepared a new roll by the hand of Baruch adding to the contents of the former one "many like words" (Jer. 36:32). This restored roll did not contain a large part of the present book, for many sections are dated at a later time (Jer. 21:1; 24:1; 27:3, 12; 28:1; 29:1; 34:1-2; 37:1; 38:5, 14 etc.; 39:1-2; 40-44; 49:34; 52) and others bear marks of a later composition. When the prophecies were arranged in their present form, it is impossible to determine, though there is nothing in the book requiring a date long after the death of the prophet. Chapter 52 was probably not the work of Jeremiah (Jer. 51:64). It agrees

almost word for word with II Kings 24:18 to 25:30 and is thought by many to have been added to Jeremiah from that source.

2. *Critical Opinion.* Modern critics from internal evidence deny that Jeremiah wrote the following sections: Jer. 10:1-16; 16:14f; 17:26; 25:13; 27:1; 30:23f; 32:17-23; 39:1-2, 4-10; 40:1-6 and 50:1 to 51:58. Davidson distinguishes three stages in the history of the book (H. B. D. Vol. 11 p. 575).

a. Jeremiah's second roll which he makes to include chapters 1-6, 7-10 (except 10:1-16) 11:1 to 12:6; 14-15; 16:1 to 17:18; 25 in its original form and possibly 18; 20:7f; 22:10f; 45 and parts of 46-49.

b. Soon after the prophet's death some persons either in Babylon or Palestine collected all they could of the work of Jeremiah, making his biography as complete as possible. They added the headings of the prophecies. Kuenen suggests the latter half of the Exile as the date of this redaction which gave the book the form which is the basis of the Hebrew and Greek texts.

c. Certain modifications and additions were made after the Exile. Some of these were admitted to all manuscripts, while others were excluded from those manuscripts which underlie the Septuagint.

All this is admitted to be largely conjectural. In the absence of fuller information, we cannot do better than express the probability that the book received its present form at the hands of an editor soon after Jeremiah's death and that the whole, with the exception of chapter 52 and possibly certain brief insertions, was the work of that prophet.

3. *The Text.* The text of the Septuagint differs more widely from the Hebrew in Jeremiah than in

any other book of the Old Testament. The prophecies concerning foreign nations (Chaps. 46-51) are inserted after 25:13 and arranged differently, and 33:14-26 are dropped. In many passages the Greek text is shorter than the Hebrew making the entire book about one-eighth smaller. Several different theories have been advanced to account for these variations. Whatever be the true explanation, there is no warrant for considering the Greek form of the book more trustworthy than the Hebrew in view of the carelessness of the Septuagint translators and the careless transmission of its text.*

III. **Author.**

Jeremiah was the son of Hilkiah, a priest who lived at Anathoth in Benjamin (Jer. 1:1). He was ordained a prophet in his youth (1:4-10). His first prophecy was given in the thirteenth year of Josiah's reign (627 B.C.). He continued to prophesy during the reigns of Josiah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin until the destruction of Jerusalem in the eleventh year of Zedekiah (586 B.C)—in all 41 years. His life was threatened by the men of Anathoth and later the hostility to him became general. Yet he continued fearlessly to utter the divine judgments. He was put in the stocks (Jer. 20:1-3). During the siege of Jerusalem he was cast into prison because his prophecies of the fall of the city were considered friendly to the Chaldeans (Jer. 27:1-15). Zedekiah released him

* Recent discovery in Egypt shows that the Jews had a temple and offered sacrifices at Elephantine in Egypt to Yahu, the God of Heaven, in Jeremiah's time (Jer. 44: 17-19). Possibly the Septuagint was taken from a form of the book current among these Jews.

for a time but he was again in prison by command of the princes when the city fell (Jer. 38). Nebuzaradan, the Chaldean general, released him at the command of Nebuchadnezzar. When Gedaliah, the governor of Judah, was murdered, Jeremiah tried to dissuade the Jews from going to Egypt. Nevertheless they went and took him with them. He prophesied concerning them at Tahpanhes in Egypt (Jer. 43:8 to 44:30). The date of his death is unknown.

IV. **Theme.**

The book of Jeremiah reflects his times and character. They were times of misfortune and increasing apostasy in Israel, while the prophet's character was deeply sensitive and emotional. Three important events occurred during his ministry, the battle of Megiddo, in which Josiah, the last great and good king of Judah, was slain by the Egyptians (II Chron. 35:20-27), the battle of Carchemish, in which the Babylonians wrested from Egypt the dominion of western Asia and thus became the lords of Judah, and the destruction of Jerusalem and deportation of the people to Babylon. Jeremiah stood almost alone in the effort to stem the tide of apostasy which he foresaw would engulf the people of God. His work was characterized by an intense love of Judah and an absolute fearlessness in his determination to deliver God's warning message. The unpopularity and persecution with which his faithfulness was received, saddened his sensitive nature and at times even embittered him. The prevailing tone of sorrow and judgment which pervades his writings is but the natural feeling of a pious soul in such a time.

Yet the book is not utterly hopeless. Though Jere-

miah does not rise to the prophetic heights of Isaiah, there are many signs of his faith in the return of Israel and the ultimate triumph of God's purposes. This was grounded in his intense belief in the everlasting love of God for His own. Beyond the chastisement of the Exile he saw clearly the coming of the Branch of Righteousness and the establishment of a New Covenant. In this last prediction (Jer. 31:31-34) he displays a spiritual insight into God's plan of the ages, which is unequalled by any other prophet of the old dispensation.

V. **Divisions.**

1. Prophecies concerning Judah to the fall of Jerusalem. Chapters 1-38.

This includes warning, lamentation, historical passages, and symbolic actions.

2. History and prophecy concerning the people after the fall of Jerusalem. Chapters 39-45.

3. Prophecies concerning the Gentiles. Chapters 46-51.

4. Supplementary account of the deportation of the people, not by Jeremiah. Chapter 52.

III

EZEKIEL

I. Name. The book is named from its author יְחֶזְקֵאל meaning "God strengtheneth" or "God is strong." The Septuagint form of the name is Ἰεζεκιήλ and the Vulgate Ezechiel. Luther gave the form Hesekiel. The English follows the Vulgate.

II. **Composition.** The genuineness and unity of the book of Ezekiel have never been seriously questioned. All schools of criticism are agreed that we have the book substantially as it came from the prophet's hand. Even Cornill says: "If there is any book of the Old Testament which bears the mark of authenticity on its face and lies before us in the form in which it came from the hand of its author, it is the book of Ezekiel" (Einleitung p. 176). This uniform opinion is based upon the marked characteristics of the book throughout and the evident arrangement and plan.

The critics affirm that the text of the book is very corrupt. Baudissin suggests that in some places the Massoretic Text might be improved in conformity with that of the Septuagint, although he does not think the Alexandrian text better throughout. The greater uncertainty concerning the text of the Septuagint, however, makes it a poor guide for the rectification of the Hebrew.

III. **Author.** Ezekiel was the son of Buzi and of a priestly family (Ezek. 1:3). In his young manhood he was carried captive from Judah with Jehoiachin

(597 B.C. II Kings 24:11-16; Ezek. 33:21; 40:1) eleven years before the destruction of Jerusalem. He lived at Tel-Abib on the river Chebar, the Kabaru or Grand Canal near Nippur. His call and ordination to the prophetic office took place five years after he went into exile (592 B.C.). He was married (24:18) and lived in his own house where the elders of the people came to him for counsel (8:1; 14:1; 20:1). His prophecies seem to have been received coldly (33:30-33) though there is not sufficient evidence that he was persecuted. His last dated prophecy was in the 27th year of his captivity (29:17 B.C. 570). Hence Ezekiel's ministry covered at least 22 years, B.C. 592-570. There is a late and unreliable tradition that he was slain by a prince for denouncing idolatry.

Ezekiel was probably 25 years old when he was carried captive (1:1-2). Before this time he was doubtless familiar with the prophecies of Jeremiah, who had already prophesied 30 years in Jerusalem. His work in Babylonia was contemporaneous with the latter part of Jeremiah's ministry in Jerusalem till the final destruction of that city (586 B.C.). Ezekiel continued to prophesy after that time in Babylonia while Jeremiah was in Egypt.

IV. **Theme.** The great prophet of the Exile differed from the other major prophets, Isaiah and Jeremiah, in two important respects.

a. His work did not have to do with the government of Judah. He was in no sense a political or social reformer. Among those who had been carried far from their native land, his work was rather that of comfort and exhortation for the individual. He was also far removed from the court of Babylon where Daniel lived.

b. For the same reason he was more a writer than a speaker. In this respect he is unique among the prophets. His words were to "all the house of Israel." Hence they were preserved in book form for generations to come.

The great subjects of Ezekiel's visions are the destruction of Jerusalem, the judgment upon the nations, and the restoration of all Israel to their land and worship. In the last of these subjects he displays his priestly training much more than Jeremiah. His knowledge of the temple and its ritual is minute. In foretelling the destruction of the city because of its idolatry, we also miss Jeremiah's dominant tone of sadness. Ezekiel was very severe in his denunciations of the ungodly but equally tender in his invitations to repentance. He desired that the exiles should learn the lesson of their chastisement. If they did so he had for them the comforting assurance of restoration. The profound and often grand symbolism of his book is the most important source of that of the Revelation. Ezekiel's prophecies exhibit a powerful imagination and much meditation but are less poetic than those of other prophets. The orderly arrangement of the book is evidently the result of his own plan.

V. **Divisions.**

1. Prophecies foretelling the Fall of Jerusalem. Chapters 1-24.

a. The prophet's call and ordination. Chapters 1-3.

b. Prophecies in the Fifth Year. Chapters 4-7.

c. Prophecies in the Sixth Year. Chapters 8-19.

d Prophecies in the Seventh year. Chapters 20-22.

e. Prophecy in the Ninth Year. Chapter 24.

2. Judgments upon the Nations. Chapters 25-32.
   a. In the Ninth Year. Chapter 25.
   b. In the Eleventh Year. Chapters 26-28.
   c. In the Tenth, Twenty-seventh and Eleventh Years, against Egypt. Chapters 29-32.

3. Prophecies of the Return from Exile and Establishment. Chapters 33-48.
   a. In the Twelfth Year. Chapters 33-39.
   b. In the Twenty-fifth Year 40-48.

IV

THE TWELVE

(1) *Hosea*

I. Name. The book is named from its author הוֹשֵׁעַ "salvation." The name is the same in Hebrew as the original name of Joshua (Num. 13:8, 16) and that of the last king of Israel (II Kings 15:30 etc.). The Greek form of the prophet's name is Ὡσηέ and the Latin Osee. In the Authorized Version Joshua's original name is Oshea, the name of the king is Hoshea, and that of the prophet Hosea. In the Revised Version the first two are named correctly Hoshea and the prophet incorrectly Hosea.

II. Composition. The greater part of the book is acknowledged to be the work of that prophet. Several critics, however, such as Stade, Wellhausen, Cornill and Harper, assert that it contains many later interpolations. Harper classifies them as follows:

1. References to Judah added by a Judaistic editor after the Exile. The principal of these are 1:7; 5:10, 12, 13, 14; 6:4; 6:11a; 8:14; 10:11b; 11:12b and 12:2.

Answer.—a. Hosea looked upon the kings of the northern kingdom as usurpers and the house of David in Jerusalem as the rightful rulers (3:5; 8:4). He therefore dates his prophecy according to the legitimate rulers even though his ministry was in the northern kingdom.

b. The allusions of Hosea to the southern kingdom are not more numerous than those of Isaiah to the northern kingdom, although his ministry was in the southern. The relation between the two kingdoms was intimate according to the prophetic view.

2. The Messianic allusions (1:10 to 2:1; 2:6-7, 14-16, 18-23; 3:5; 11:8b, 9a, 11 and 14:1-8) are said to be inconsistent with Hosea's situation and declaration of the approaching destruction of Samaria. They are therefore assigned to an exilic date after Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah.

Answer.—Other critics such as Strack and Driver admit that it is a characteristic of the prophets to give an ideal picture of the restoration after severe threatenings.

3. Explanatory insertions "of a technical, archæological or historical character" (4:13d; 5:6; 7:4, 16c; 8:8b; 9:1b, 9a, 10; 10:5, 14b; 12:13; 13:4b-7) were added from time to time.

Answer.—These may be satisfactorily explained as comments of the prophet himself.

4. Miscellaneous interpolations "for which no special motive may be discovered" (8:4-5, 10, 14; 9:1a, 8).

Answer.—In the condensed form in which the work of the prophets has come down to us, imperfect connection with the context is not sufficient reason for regarding a passage as an insertion.

5. "Chapter 14:10—is a product of the later wisdom period." Thus the book did not receive its present form according to Harper until the Greek period (B.C. 333).

Answer.—The subjective and arbitrary character of these assertions is sufficient refutation. Although in default of historical evidence it cannot be proved that

these are not insertions, the presumption must always be in favor of the unity of a book.

The text of Hosea is said to be in places incurably corrupt. But the passages cited (4:4, 18; 5:2, 7, 11; 6:7; 7:4; 8:10b, 13; 9:8, 13; 10:9; 11:3, 6, 7, 12) are inadequate to prove that assertion.

III. **Author.** Hosea was the son of Beeri. He prophesied in the northern kingdom during the reign of Jeroboam II and later and during the time of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, the same kings of Judah with whom Isaiah labored. According to the dates of the kings derived from the scriptural figures the reign of Jeroboam II in Israel closed in 784 B.C. while that of Hezekiah in Judah began 726 B.C. If these dates be correct, Hosea's ministry must have been a very long one, covering about sixty years (785-725 B.C.). Such an explanation would require a life of eighty years. If however the dates derived from Assyrian sources be correct (Jeroboam II 782-741; Uzziah 789-753 and Hezekiah 726-697) Hosea's ministry may have been much shorter, extending over about thirty years (755-725 B.C.). In either case Amos was the contemporary of Hosea in the early part of his ministry and Isaiah, Micah and Obadiah during the later part.

Hosea was married to Gomer the daughter of Diblaim. Their three children were given symbolic names by divine command: the eldest son Jezreel, because the blood of Jezreel would be avenged; the daughter Lo-ruhamah ("not having obtained mercy") because God would show no mercy to the northern kingdom; and the youngest son Lo-ammi ("not my people") because Israel were no longer considered the people of God. The marriage of Hosea with "a wife of whoredoms"

and the children of the union are symbolic of the relation of Jehovah to Israel. The marriage and the birth of the three children actually occurred. If it were an allegory the name of the wife would be symbolical, as well as those of the children. The marriage is recorded as a literal occurrence.

IV. **Theme.** Hosea bears somewhat the same relation to the northern kingdom as Jeremiah to the southern. Each foretold the approaching destruction of the kingdom in which he ministered. The same intense and pathetic love of God for His people is characteristic of both books.

Yet Hosea was further removed from the fall of Samaria than Jeremiah from that of Jerusalem. Hosea began his ministry in a time of prosperity and foretold the speedy overthrow of the house of Jehu, of which Jeroboam II was the fourth king. During the frequent political changes and troublous times which followed Jeroboam's death, the prophet continued with great tenderness to predict the downfall of Israel and to urge the people to repentance. The fact that his message was based upon a symbolic event of great sadness in his own house, gave a warmth and pathos to his words which is not equalled by any other prophet.

V. **Divisions.**

1. The apostasy of Israel, figuratively depicted by the prophet's marrying "a wife of whoredoms." Chapters 1-3.

2. The same apostasy literally described with the yearning of Jehovah over Israel, exhortations to repentance, and promise of restoration. Chapters 4-14.

(2) *Joel*

I. **Name.** The book is named from its author, יוֹאֵל meaning "Jehovah is God." It is a very common name in scripture (I Sam. 8:2; I Chron. 4:35-43; 5:4, 12; 6:36; 7:3; 11:38; 15:7; 27:20; II Chron. 29:12; Ezra 10:43; Neh. 11:9). The form of the name in the Septuagint is *Ἰωηλ*.

II. **Date.** The book is not dated according to the reign of any king. Accordingly we are confined to internal evidences for guidance concerning the time of the prophet. Nor are these evidences many or powerful. Neither Syrians, Assyrians, nor Chaldeans are mentioned. Hence the presumption is very strong that the book was written either before the reign of Ahaz (742-726 B.C.) when those nations became prominent among the enemies of Judah, or after the Exile when they had ceased to be such (after 536 B.C.). The view of König that it belongs in the last years of Josiah's reign has met with little favor.

Credner and after him a large number of critics assign the book to the beginning of the reign of Joash in Judah (879-839 B.C.). The arguments for this view are as follows:

1. The enemies of Judah mentioned by Joel (3:4, 19) are the Phenicians, Philistines, Egypt and Edom. Of these Edom and Philistia had been at war with Judah during the reign of Jehoram (893-885 B.C.) only a few years before Joash (II Kings 8:20-22; II Chron. 21:16-17). Egypt was still hostile to Judah in that time, for Shishak had invaded Judah in the fifth year

of Rehoboam (974 B.C.) while Egypt was an ally of Judah in the century after Joash (Isaiah 30 and 31). On the other hand neither Syria nor Assyria had begun to attack Judah in the time of Joash.

2. The book of Amos makes use of Joel (compare Joel 1:4 and 2:25 with Amos 4:9; Joel 3:16 with Amos 1:2 and Joel 3:18 with Amos 9:13). That these are references of Amos to Joel and not of Joel to Amos is shown by their agreement with the circle of ideas in Joel rather than in Amos. But Amos prophesied in the reign of Uzziah of Judah (810-758 B.C.) and Jeroboam II of Israel (825-784 B.C.). Joel must therefore have preceded that time.

3. The king is not mentioned but rather the elders and priests (Joel 1:2, 13-14). This fits admirably with the time suggested. Joash ascended the throne when he was seven years of age (II Kings 11:21). In his minority Jehoiada the high-priest and the elders were the virtual rulers of the country.

4. The absence of censure for particular sins agrees with the time of Joash better than with any other which can be mentioned.

Driver, Merx, Cornill and others assign Joel to a post-exilic date, during the fifth century B.C. The principal arguments for this position are these:

1. Joel 3:2 is said to be a recollection of the scattering of Judah before the Exile.

Answer.—Keil and others have pointed out that this is a predictive passage. Therefore it contains no evidence of a post-exilic date.

2. The mention of the sale of Jewish prisoners by the Phenicians to "the sons of Javan" (Joel 3:6) is said to agree better with a post-exilic date.

Answer.—"The sons of Javan" are mentioned as a distant people not well-known to Judah, while the Phenicians, who were hostile to Judah, in the early days of the divided kingdom were the greatest maritime nation of antiquity. It is not strange that they sold Jewish captives to the Greeks as early as the time of Joash.

3. Joel makes no mention of the northern kingdom but speaks of Israel as one people (Joel 2:27; 3:2, 16). Therefore, it is argued, Israel must have already gone into exile.

Answer.—a. Since Joel's ministry was with the kingdom of Judah, he had no occasion to mention the northern kingdom.

b. Joel uses the name Israel as the original name which rightfully belonged to the southern kingdom even before the fall of Samaria.

4. No king of Judah is mentioned, implying a post-exilic time when there was no king. This matter has already been satisfactorily explained.

In addition to these arguments the following considerations are *evidence for the pre-exilic date.*

1. If the book were composed in the Persian period, its entire silence concerning Persia and its kings and the struggles which Judah underwent immediately after the Exile is very strange. The temple and its worship are well established. This fact induces Cornill to date the book about 400 B.C. But it agrees better with the time before the Exile.

2. The position between Hosea and Amos, the oldest of the Prophets, seems to indicate the ancient Hebrew tradition that Joel also was very early.

3. The literary style of Joel differs greatly from that

of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, who were his contemporaries if he prophesied after the Exile.

Thus the weight of the evidence favors the date in the time of Joash, possibly 875-865 B.C.

III. **Composition.** Rothstein has attacked the unity of the book, assigning 1:1 to 2:27 to the reign of Joash and 2:28 to 3:21 to a post-exilic date, while Cornill speaks of it as a compendium of late Jewish eschatology. The uniform plan and style of the book are sufficient answer to this view, which has not indeed met with general acceptance.

IV. **Author.** All that is known of Joel is the statement of 1:1 that he was the son of Pethuel. In the Septuagint this name has the form *Βαθουήλ* and in the Vulgate Phatuel. It is generally agreed that he ministered in the kingdom of Judah and probably in Jerusalem.

V. **Theme.** The occasion of this prophecy was an unprecedented plague of locusts in Judah. Such a plague destroys all vegetation and is a worse calamity than the devastation of an invading army. The prophet describes this visitation so vividly that it is best to consider it an actual occurrence and not a symbolic description of an invading army or of the damaging effects of profligacy and idolatry (Rev. 9:3-11). Joel views it as a judgment of Jehovah for the people's sins and urges them to repent lest a worse thing come upon them. If they do so, God will withdraw the punishment and give them abundant blessings. Accordingly the latter part of the book is filled with a description of the spiritual blessings of Israel in the last days and the judgments of God upon their enemies. The book is preëminently eschatological. Yet the predictions were

meant primarily for the comfort of the people in Joel's time.

VI. Divisions.

1. The plague of locusts and the proclamation of a fast. 1:1 to 2:27.

2. Blessing and judgment in the last days. 2:28 to 3:21.

(3) *Amos*

I. Name. The book is named from its author עָמוֹס meaning "burden" or "burden-bearer." Its form in the Septuagint is Ἀμώς. The name should not be confused with that of Amoz, the father of Isaiah, which has a different form in the Hebrew (אָמוֹץ).

II. **Composition.** The book is almost universally acknowledged to be the work of Amos. The recently expressed opinion that it was a much later writing, ascribed by its unknown author to the Amos mentioned in the book, is sufficiently answered by a consideration of the agreement of the book with the times of Amos.

More general is the view that the book contains several later interpolations. The arguments are similar to those concerning the alleged interpolations in Hosea, viz., the references to Judah and the lack of connection of certain passages with the remainder of the book. There is a wide divergence of opinion among critics on this subject. Harper is the most radical, rejecting 1:1-2, 9-12; 2:4-5, 12; 4:7b, 8a, 13; 5:8-9, 18b, 22b; 6:2, 9-11a; 7:1d, 8a; 8:2a, 6, 11a; 9:5-6, 8-15. Cheyne, Duhm, Stade, and Wellhausen reject a few of these passages with one or two others, but W. R. Smith and Kuenen defend 2:4-5; 4:13; 5:8-9 and 9:5-6.

Answer.—This difference of opinion, even among radical critics, shows that the arguments for rejection are inadequate. Since Amos came from Tekoa in Judah, it is difficult to see why he should not mention Judah and Jerusalem. The assertion that other passages are too loosely connected with Amos to be the work of that

prophet is largely subjective. Logically carried out it would deny that an author can introduce a parenthesis in his work. The critics manufacture an ideal Amos from a part of his book and then affirm that other statements of the book do not agree with that ideal. The difficulty is not with the book but with the false method of the critics. If there are interpolations in it, which is inherently improbable, our knowledge is too meagre to discover them.

III. **Author.** Amos was one of the herdsmen of Tekoa in Judah, about ten miles south of Jerusalem. The word rendered "herdsmen" (נֹקְדִים) is found elsewhere only once (II Kings 3:4) and is supposed to mean the shepherd of a peculiar small kind of sheep, famous for their wool. He also tended larger cattle and was a dresser of sycamore trees (Amos 7:14). From his occupation as well as the omission of his father's name we may conclude that he came from an obscure and poor family. He did not belong to the prophetic order but was called from his ordinary occupation to be a prophet in Israel (Amos 7:14-15). He went to Bethel, the principal sanctuary of the northern kingdom, and foretold the destruction of that kingdom for their sins. After a time, the chief priest of Bethel, Amaziah, reported him to king Jeroboam II as a traitor and ordered him to leave the country. It was probably after his return to Tekoa that he committed to writing this summary of his prophecy.

His exact time is difficult to determine because of the uncertainty concerning the dates of the kings of the northern kingdom. If the older chronology be correct Jeroboam II of Israel was contemporary with Uzziah of Judah from 810 to 784 B.C. If the dates from

Assyrian sources be preferred, they were contemporaries from 782 to 753 B.C. On the former calculation the ministry of Amos was probably about 795-785 B.C. but on the latter 760-750 B.C. The recent attempt to make the date still later (about 734 B.C.) has not been successful. The time of the earthquake in Uzziah's reign being unknown, it furnishes no clew to establish the time of the prophecy (Amos 1:1; Zech. 14:5). Hosea was the younger contemporary and successor of Amos. Jonah also prophesied in the northern kingdom in the time of Amos (II Kings 14:25).

IV. **Theme.** The principal subject of the prophecy is the judgment upon Israel because of their idolatry and other sins. The time of Jeroboam II was one of great temporal prosperity but it was also characterized by profligacy, oppression and injustice. Against these Amos inveighed fearlessly, foretelling the ruin of Israel, which occurred sixty years later (722 B.C.). He also foretold the destruction of the surrounding nations and even of Judah for their sins. He presents a high moral standard of conduct in preference to a cold formal religion. Jehovah is to him the God of all nations, who deals with all according to their works (9:7). Yet at the end of the prophecy he foretells the restoration of the worship as in David's time.

V. **Divisions.**

1. Judgment upon the surrounding nations. Chapters 1-2.

2. Judgment upon Israel. Chapters 3-6.

3. Symbolic predictions of Israel's doom, closing with the promise of restoration. Chapters 7-9.

(4) *Obadiah*

I. **Name.** The book is named from its author עֹבַדְיָה meaning "worshipper of Jehovah." This was a common name (I Kings 18:3-4; I Chron. 3:21; 7:3; 8:28; 12:9; 27:19; II Chron. 17:7; 34:12; Ezra 8:29; Neh. 10:5; 12:25). In the Septuagint the title is given in the genitive Ὀβδιού following verse 1 (ὅρασις Ὀβδιού). In the Vulgate the name is Abdias.

II. **Date and Composition.** The unity of this little book depends chiefly upon the date to which it is assigned. The prophecy of Jeremiah against Edom (49:7-22) exhibits much in common with that of Obadiah. All critics are agreed that Obadiah did not borrow from Jeremiah but that rather Obadiah represents the older form of the prophecy. Hence the substance of Obadiah must antedate Jeremiah. On the other hand, there is a difference of opinion concerning the allusions to calamities in Judah in verses 11, 12 and 14. Many critics confidently affirm that these verses refer to the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. as a past event. Others find the same reference in the prediction of verse 20. But if so the book cannot be a unit. Hence the critics affirm that verses 1-9 and possibly 16a, 18-19 and 20b were the work of the original Obadiah who wrought some time before the Exile, and that the references to the destruction of Jerusalem in verses 10-14 and the other parts of the book were added by another writer after the Exile. Cornill and Kuenen date this redaction in the fifth century but Cheyne assigns it to about 350 B.C.

Answer.—All the facts in the case are explained much more simply on the supposition that the entire book of Obadiah was written by that prophet before the time of Jeremiah. Then Jeremiah made use of Obadiah directly. It is not necessary to refer verses 11, 12 and 14 to the events of 586 B.C. They are better explained by reference to II Chron. 21:16-17 where it is recorded that the Philistines and Arabians invaded Judah in the reign of Jehoram and carried away the king's wives and all but one of his sons besides much treasure. Amos apparently refers to this event in connection with Edom (1:6). Whether verse 20 refers to the invasion in the days of Jehoram or the captivity in Babylon need not influence the decision as to date because it is a prediction. The assertion of Driver that "the expressions which Obadiah uses [notice especially "cast lots upon Jerusalem"] appear to be too strong to be referred with probability to this invasion, which, to judge from the silence of the Book of Kings, was little more than a predatory incursion, from the effects of which Judah speedily recovered" (Introduction p. 320), does not take sufficient account of the statement of the Chronicler. Whatever be the true explanation of the silence of the Book of Kings, the deportation of the king's household and all his treasure was a sufficient national misfortune to warrant the statements of Obadiah. The casting lots upon Jerusalem does not necessarily imply that the city was entirely destroyed. The invasion of the Philistines and Arabians occurred toward the close of Jehoram's reign or about 887 B.C. Obadiah must have prophesied after this event—how much later, it is impossible to determine. The position of the book near the beginning of the twelve Minor Prophets seems to

indicate the Hebrew opinion of its great antiquity. The conjecture of Davis (Dictionary of Bible p. 528) that Obadiah prophesied in the reign of Ahaz when Edom was specially hostile to Judah (II Chron. 28: 17) seems quite probable. This would give the date 742-726 B.C. Upon this theory Obadiah was a contemporary of Isaiah, Hosea and Micah.

III. **Author.** Nothing whatever is known concerning this prophet's life. Josephus identifies him with Obadiah, the governor under Ahab (I Kings 18: 3-4) but the date of his prophecy as well as its references to Judah show that he lived and prophesied in Judah much later than that time.

IV. **Theme.** The prophecy relates entirely to Edom in its unbrotherly relation to Israel. These unbrotherly acts are recalled and the destruction of Edom is foretold. On the contrary Israel is to be established and enlarged.

(5) *Jonah*

I. **Name.** The book is named from its author יוֹנָה meaning a "dove." In the Septuagint the name takes the form Ἰωνᾶς and in the Vulgate Jonas, while in the Authorized Version of the New Testament it is Jona, Jonas, or Jonah.

II. **Authorship and Date.** Jonah was the son of Amittai. The only mention of him in the Old Testament outside of this book is in II Kings 14:25. There we are informed that he lived in Gath-Hepher in the territory of Zebulun (Josh. 19:13) north of Nazareth and that he had prophesied to Jeroboam II that the Lord would restore the ancient boundary to Israel. This probably occurred early in the reign of that king of which the dates are B.C. 825-784 or by another calculation B.C. 782-741. The events recorded in the book of Jonah are not dated nor do we know how long his ministry lasted. It is probable that he wrote the book soon after his return from Nineveh. He was a prophet of the northern kingdom about 825-784 B.C. and his only contemporary prophet was Amos.

Many *critics deny that Jonah wrote the book* and assign it to a post-exilic date, 500 B.C. or later. The grounds of this conclusion are as follows:

1. It is asserted that Jonah is not said to have been the author.

2. The book is said to contain several Aramaisms and late words or expressions. The shorter form of the relative pronoun is used. The title "God of Heaven"

(Jonah 1:9) is used by Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel but never by a pre-exilic writer. טַעַם is used in the Aramaic sense of a decree (Jonah 3:7). Also סְפִינָה (1:5), יִתְעַשֵּׁת (1:6), יְשַׁתֵּק (1:12), וַיְמַן (2:1 etc.) and עָמַלְתָּ (4:10) are considered late forms.

3. Historical indications of the date are found in Jonah 3:3 and 3:6. In the former passage it is said "Nineveh was (הָיְתָה) a great city," as though its greatness were past. This is said to indicate a date after 606 B.C. when Nineveh was overthrown. In the latter passage the king of Assyria is called "the king of Nineveh," a title which according to Sayce could not have been used while the Assyrian Kingdom endured. Furthermore if the name of this king had been known to the author, he would probably have mentioned it.

4. The poem in Jonah 2 is said to have borrowed from certain late Psalms.

Verse	3.....	compare.....	Psalm	42:7
"	5.....	"	"	69:1
"	9.....	"	"	50:14

Answer.—1. The book is ascribed to Jonah by title in the same way that the books of Hosea, Joel, Micah, Zephaniah, Haggai, and Zechariah are ascribed to those prophets. The fact that the word of Jehovah to Jonah was a command to go to Nineveh rather than to give exhortations to the people does not alter the force of the title.

2. The literary argument is confessedly weak in view of the small amount of Hebrew literature by which we can trace the usages of the language in various times. Forms and words are not necessarily late because they

occur only or chiefly in late books of the canon, nor necessarily Aramaisms because they agree with the usual Aramaic as against the usual Hebrew form. In particular the shorter relative is found in Judges (5:7; 6:17; 7:12; and 8:26). It was necessary for Jonah (1:9) to explain to his shipmates who Jehovah was. The name "God of Heaven" was a very natural and proper one in speaking to the heathen. That the same word should be used for the decree of the king of Nineveh in Jonah's time (טַעַם Jonah 3:7) which was used for those of Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes (Ezra 6:14) is not surprising. סְפִינָה is found nowhere else in the Old Testament but it is a true Hebrew form. יִתְעַשַּׁת is found only once as an Aramaic word (Dan. 6:3) and once in this Hebrew passage. It is an evidence of the historicity of the book for it is a foreign word in the mouth of the foreign shipmaster. שָׁחַק is found also in Psa. 107:30 and Prov. 26:20 in the same sense and the Piel of כָּנָה in Job 7:3 and Psa. 6:17. If the noun עָמָל is found in writings before the time of Jonah (Judges 10:16; Ps. 90:10, etc.) it is difficult to see why the verb עָמַלְתָּ is unnatural in his time.

3. The statement, "Nineveh was a great city" (Jonah 3:3), is a parenthesis which may have been added to the book at a later time. It is not however impossible from the pen of Jonah. It stands in the midst of a description in the past tense and need not imply that Nineveh had ceased to be a great city when the prophet wrote. The title "King of Nineveh" was the natural one since the story relates only to that city and not to the whole kingdom. There is no evidence from the absence of the king's name that the author

lived much later than Jonah and did not know it. The book was intended for Israel. Since the king was unknown to them, it is not strange that Jonah omitted his name.

4. Aside from the question concerning the date of the Psalms mentioned, it is just as possible that the Psalms quoted from Jonah as Jonah from the Psalms. There is therefore no argument for the post-exilic date of the book of Jonah from the passages cited.

III. **Purpose.** The purpose of the book was to teach that God's gracious plans were not confined to Israel, as the chosen people selfishly thought, but were intended to include the heathen. Therefore the prophet was sent on a mission to Nineveh. He tried to escape toward Tarshish because, like his countrymen, he did not wish to preach the gospel to Nineveh. For the same reason he was displeased at the repentance of Nineveh. The object-lesson and argument of Jehovah with Jonah were really His argument with Israel (Jonah 4:4-11).

IV. **Interpretation.** Many modern writers consider the book an allegory in which Jonah stands for disobedient Israel, the sea for the nations, the great fish for Babylon, the period in the belly of the fish for the Exile, and the subsequent obedience and disappointment of Jonah for these events in Israel's history. It is argued:

1. If this were a historical book, it would have been placed with the other histories and not among the Prophets.

2. The sudden and universal repentance of Nineveh and the decree of its king are exceedingly improbable.

3. Nebuchadnezzar is represented elsewhere as a

dragon which swallows Israel and casts him up (Jer. 51:34) and the duration of the Exile is said to be three days (Hos. 6:2).

In defense of the historical character of the book are the following arguments.

1. The style of the book is like that of simple history. The greater part of it is in prose. The only poetry is Jonah's prayer to God. The book is not presented as an allegory. It speaks of well-known places (Joppa, Tarshish and Nineveh). Its principal character is a historical one whose name, lineage and birthplace are mentioned elsewhere (II Kings 14:25). The names are not symbolical as in an allegory.

2. The references of our Lord to the book (Matt. 12:39-40; Luke 11:29-30) imply his belief, which indeed was the universal opinion of the Jews, that the book contained real history.

3. The book was placed among the Prophets because it was written by a prophet. It was not however placed among the prophetic histories (Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings) because it was not mere history, but typical, predictive history. This typical interpretation justifies its position among the Minor Prophets.

4. Hosea and Jeremiah may have borrowed from Jonah. At any rate the passages in those prophecies are too isolated to prove the allegorical interpretation of Jonah.

5. Mere improbability of the events recorded cannot be an argument against their having occurred. The appearance of a strange preacher in Nineveh with his dreadful warning may well have impressed the mind of a superstitious king, who like the ancients recognized the real existence of the gods of other nations. The

king viewed Jonah as a warning messenger from Jehovah.

Winckler compares the religious reforms of Adad-nirari III (812-783 B.C.) with the monotheistic reforms of Amenophis IV in Egypt and states that the former was the king "whom Jonah found at Nineveh when he went there and found royal sympathy with his teaching." (History of Babylonia and Assyria, p. 232.)

V. **Divisions.**

1. Jonah's disobedience and its consequences. Chapter 1.
2. Jonah's prayer in the belly of the fish. Chapter 2.
3. Jonah's second mission to Nineveh and its effects.
   a. Upon Nineveh. Chapter 3.
   b. Upon Jonah. Chapter 4.

(6) *Micah*

I. **Name.** The book is named from its author מִיכָה. This is an abbreviation of מִיכָיְהוּ meaning "Who is like Jehovah?" (Judges 17:1, 4). In the Septuagint the name is *Μιχαίας* and in the Vulgate Michæas. The English form is derived from the Hebrew.

II. **Composition.** It is generally admitted that Micah was the author of the greater part of the prophecy. Ewald and others since his time have considered chapters 6-7 so different in form and style from the first five chapters that they assign them to an anonymous prophet of the reign of Manasseh. (Notice especially Mic. 6:16.) Wellhausen and Stade think that 7:7-20 were written and added during or after the Exile because of the remarkable similarity with Isaiah 40-66. Stade, Cornill and others deny that Micah wrote chapters 4 and 5. Stade and Kuenen also assign Micah 2:12-13 to an exilic and Wellhausen to a post-exilic date.

In defense of the unity of the book we present the following considerations:

1. The expression "Hear" (1:2; 3:1; 6:1), binds the book together as the work of one author.

2. The arguments of the critics are mainly due to the fragmentary character of the book. It is not a continuous argument but a summary of his prophecies by the prophet's own hand.

3. The similarity of chapters 6-7 to Isaiah 40-66 does not indicate their late date since Isaiah 40-66 was written by Isaiah, a contemporary of Micah.

4. Chapters 4-7 exhibit the following similarities to writings in and near Micah's time.

Micah	4:1-3	compare	Isaiah 2:2-4
"	4:3	"	Joel 3:10
"	4:7	"	Is. 24:24
"	4:9	"	Is. 13:8; Is. 21:3
"	4:13*a*	"	Is. 41:15-16
"	4:13*b*	"	Is. 23:18
"	5:5	"	Is. 9:6
"	5:13	"	Is. 2:8
"	6:2	"	Hos. 4:1; Hos. 12:2
"	6:4	"	Amos 2:10
"	6:7	"	Is. 1:11
"	6:8	"	Is. 1:17; Hos. 6:6
"	6:11	"	Hos. 12:7
"	6:14	"	Hos. 4:10
"	7:1	"	Is. 24:13; Hos. 9:10
"	7:2	"	Is. 57:1
"	7:3	"	Is. 1:23; Hos. 4:18
"	7:10	"	Joel 2:17
"	7:11	"	Amos 9:11

5. The arguments for the rejection of Micah 2:12-13 are considered inadequate by most critics. The sudden change of subject is sufficiently explained by the fragmentary nature of the book.

III. **Author.** Micah was a native of Moresheth, probably the same as Moresheth-gath (Mic. 1:14) a

dependence of Gath. He was an inhabitant of the country. His prophecy accordingly does not show the same familiarity with the politics of the day as does that of Isaiah who lived at Jerusalem. He wrought during the reigns of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah but his prophecies relate to Israel as well as Judah. Jeremiah quotes Micah 3:12 as having been given in the days of Hezekiah (Jer. 26:18). Thus Micah was a younger contemporary of Isaiah and Hosea and the approximate date of his ministry was 745-700 B.C. Some have supposed that he survived during the early part of Manasseh's reign and wrote chapters 6-7 in that time, but such a supposition has no confirmation outside of the book itself.

IV. **Theme.** Micah's prophecy concerns both Judah and Israel, but the part relating to Israel is brief. He lived to see the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C. The same doom he foretold for Jerusalem on account of their sins. As a man of the people however he dwelt not so much upon political sins as upon the oppression of the peasantry by the rich landowners of Judah. He took the part of the poor against the rich. His prophecy is religious and moral rather than political. He enumerates the sins of the people and foretells their punishment. Yet beyond the days of punishment he foresees the blessed time of permanent establishment and the birth of the Messiah. While not so exalted in style as Isaiah, Micah is yet vivid and full of local references.

V. **Divisions.**

1. Judgment upon Israel and Judah. Chapters 1-2.
2. Judgment followed by restoration and the Messianic reign. Chapters 3-5.
3. Reproof and promises. Chapters 6-7.

(7) *Nahum*

I. **Name.** The book is named from its author נַחוּם meaning "compassionate." In the Septuagint and New Testament the name has the form *Ναούμ* and in the Vulgate Nahum.

II. **Composition.** Until recently the integrity and authenticity of the book of Nahum were not called in question. Since 1880 however Bickell, Gunkel, Nowack and others have endeavored to show that Nahum 1:2 to 2:3 are the remains of an acrostic psalm which was composed after the Exile and prefixed to the genuine book of Nahum. This view is not generally received. It is said by its defenders that this psalm was placed before Nahum because its subject formed an appropriate introduction to the book.

This admission vitiates their argument. Nahum placed the psalm where it is for this very reason, that it was a suitable introduction to his book. In order to substantiate the claim to an alphabetic arrangement it is necessary to alter the text in several places, to transpose in others, and to make some verses very long and others very short. Even if that arrangement can be established it is very scanty evidence for the late date of the Psalm. The acrostic arrangement may have been in use in the century before the Exile.

III. **Date.** By common consent, the prophecy of Nahum is dated between the capture of No-amon or Thebes by Assurbanipal in 664-3 B.C. and the fall of Nineveh in 606 B.C. because the former event is referred to as past (3:8) and the latter is foretold.

The date cannot be fixed more precisely. The suggestion of Kuenen, that the unsuccessful attack of Cyaxeres upon Nineveh about 623 B.C. may have been the occasion of this prophecy, is as likely as any.*

IV. **Author.** The sum of our knowledge concerning Nahum is that he is called "the Elkoshite" (1:1). The location of this Elkosh is uncertain. The identification with Alkush 27 miles north of Mosul (the ancient Nineveh) where the prophet's grave is shown is based upon an unreliable modern tradition. Jerome's identification with Elkesi (modern Elkozeh) in northern Galilee is more likely. The reference to Judah (1:15) seems however to imply that Nahum lived in the southern kingdom. Therefore the most probable theory is that which places Elkosh about midway between Jerusalem and Gaza. If the date be correct, Nahum was a contemporary of Zephaniah.

V. **Theme.** The subject of the prophecy is the downfall of Nineveh, the capital of Assyria, the great enemy of Israel. The prophet describes the sins of Nineveh and its overthrow in vivid language. For grandeur of style, Nahum is excelled only by Isaiah.

VI. **Divisions.**

1. Psalm, descriptive of Jehovah's majesty. Chapter 1.

2. Judgment upon Nineveh. Chapters 2-3.

* In his recent book on this prophecy Haupt considers it a liturgical compilation in honor of the victory of Judas Maccabaeus over Nicanor in 161 B.C. He finds four poems in the book, of which the last two were taken from poems written by one who saw the fall of Nineveh, while the first two were of the Maccabean period.

(8) *Habakkuk*

I. **Name.** The book is named from its author חֲבַקּוּק. The orgin of this name is doubtful. The older derivation is from חָבַק to embrace, hence "the embraced." Friedrich Delitzsch connects it with the Assyrian, ḫambaḳuḳu, a certain garden plant, and prefers the vocalization חַבָּקּוּק. This derivation is made more possible by the Septuagint form of the name *Ἀμβακούκ* or *Ἀμβακούμ*. In the Vulgate it is Habacuc. The English follows the Hebrew form חֲבַקּוּק.

II. **Date and Composition.** The book bears no date but it was evidently written during the reign of Jehoiakim in Judah (608-597 B.C.) Hab. 1:5-6 belongs just before the conquests of the Chaldeans. This began in 606 B.C. when they conquered Nineveh, and was completed in 604 B.C. when they gained the supremacy of Western Asia by the victory over the Egyptians at Carchemish. In 601-600 the Chaldeans invaded Judah. Hence the book may be dated 608-600 B.C.

Since Hab. 1:5-6 implies a date before the rise of the Chaldeans while Hab. 1:13-16; 2:8a; 10, 17 look upon their conquests as past, Giesebrecht and Wellhausen consider 1:5-11 a once independent prophecy older than the remainder of chapters 1 and 2. Stade and Kuenen think 2:9-20 inapplicable to the Chaldeans and from a later hand. Wellhausen opposes this contention. Many critics look upon chapter 3 as a Psalm taken from some liturgical collection but not the work

of Habakkuk, their chief argument being that it fails to allude to the circumstances of Habakkuk's age.

Answer.—1. The presumption is that an author wrote all the work which bears his name, unless there be strong evidence to the contrary. In this case such evidence is lacking. It is unreasonable to require proof of the genuineness of every part of a book.

2. Since we do not know positively the exact time of Habakkuk nor the history of his time in detail, the assumption that certain parts of the book do not reflect the conditions of the age is premature.

3. The Psalm contained in chapter 3 need not have been occasioned by the same events as the prophecy. It is headed "A Prayer of Habakkuk."

III. **Author.** Habakkuk prophesied in the kingdom of Judah during the reign of Jehoiakim (608-597 B.C.). Some have concluded from the liturgical arrangement of the Psalm in chapter 3 that he was a Levite and a member of the temple choir. Such a conclusion lacks proof. He was a contemporary of Jeremiah, whose ministry however was much longer and more influential.

IV. **Theme.** The wickedness of Israel is revealed to the prophet and their future overthrow by the Chaldeans. The even greater wickedness of the Chaldeans is described and their final doom therefor. The majesty of God is praised in song. Habakkuk differs from Jeremiah in depicting the sin and punishment of the Chaldeans as well as those of Judah.

V. **Divisions.**

1. Judgment upon Judah and the Chaldeans. Chapters 1-2.

2. Psalm of Faith. Chapter 3.

(9) *Zephaniah*

I. Name. The book is named from its author צְפַנְיָה meaning "He whom Jehovah has hidden or protected." It was borne by three other persons in Old Testament history (1 Chron. 6:36-38; Jer. 21:1; Zech. 6:10). In the Septuagint the word has the form Σοφονίας and in the Vulgate Sophonias. The English form is derived from the Hebrew.

II. Date. The statement of the superscription which assigns this book to the reign of Josiah (640-609 B.C.) is disputed only by König, who admits the genuineness of the entire prophecy but assigns it to the decade after the death of Josiah. The majority of critics agree in placing the book before the reformation instituted by Josiah in 621 B.C. The condition of religion and morals reflected in 1:4-6, 8-9, 12 and 3:1-3, 7 shows that the reformation had not yet taken place. Many suppose that the prophet's allusion to an approaching foe refers to the Scythians who according to Herodotus invaded western Asia about this time. It was perhaps in 626 B.C. that they passed down the Philistine coast. This would give Zephaniah a date about 626-621 B.C.

III. Composition. Some portions of chapters 2 and 3 are denied to Zephaniah by certain critics though there is a noticeable lack of agreement in their conclusions. Kuenen accepts all but 3:14-20 which he considers a post-exilic addition because of its differences in tone and situation. Stade and Wellhausen reject all of chapter 3 and certain verses of chapter 2 (1-3, 8-11). G. A. Smith accepts all of chapter 2 except verses 8-11, re-

arranges 3:1-13 and assigns 3:14-20 to the end of the Exile or the period of the restoration. Driver is in doubt concerning 3:14-20 though he does not consider it impossible that Zephaniah wrote it.

The only approach to unanimity concerns 3:14-20. An unprejudiced reading of the book will show that this is an appropriate climax of the prophecy. Judgment is pronounced upon Judah and Jerusalem. In 3:11-13 they are represented as repenting and receiving the pardon of God. The promises of blessing in 3:14-20 follow naturally. While their tone is more exalted than that of the remainder of the book, it is justified by the nature of the subject and does not require the supposition of another author or another time. The period of the restoration was present to Zephaniah by his prophetic insight.

IV. **Author.** Zephaniah is said to have been the son of Cushi the son of Gedaliah, the son of Amariah the son of Hizkiah (1:1). This Hizkiah or Hezekiah is plausibly supposed by many to be the king of that name who reigned 726-697 B.C. If so Amariah was a younger brother of Manasseh, the successor of Hezekiah. Abundant time is allowed between the accession of Manasseh (697 B.C.) and the year 626 B.C. for the generations mentioned in Zephaniah. If the Hezekiah in Zephaniah's ancestry be not King Hezekiah, we have no sufficient explanation of the prophet's departing from the usual custom of mentioning only the father in his superscription. If the supposition be true, this is explained as well as his mention of the king's children (1:8). Zephaniah was a young man of about Josiah's age in whose reign he prophesied. From his kinship as well as his office, he was probably intimate

with the king, and the reforms which Josiah instituted even before 621 B.C. (11 Chron. 34:3-7) may have been urged by him. Zephaniah's ministry began about the same time as that of Jeremiah but lasted only a short time (626-621 B.C.). He undoubtedly lived in Jerusalem. Nahum was also his contemporary.

IV. **Theme.** Zephaniah is especially concerned with the approaching judgment upon Judah for their sins although he foretells also the divine judgments upon the surrounding nations—Philistia, Moab, Ammon, Ethiopia and Assyria. His description of the day of wrath which occasioned the great medieval hymn, Dies Iræ, is as terrible as any in the Old Testament. On the other hand his closing passage regarding the blessings of the restored Jerusalem is unsurpassed for gentleness and beauty (notice especially 3:16-17).

V. **Divisions.**

1. Judgment upon Judah. Chapter 1.
2. Judgment upon the nations. 2:1 to 3:8.
3. Deliverance for Judah. 3:9-20.

(10) *Haggai*

I. **Name.** The book is named from its author חַגַּי meaning "festal," possibly because he was born on a festival day. The form of the name in the Septuagint is Ἀγγαῖος and in the Vulgate Aggaeus. The English form follows the Hebrew.

II. **Composition.** That the entire book was written by Haggai has scarcely been questioned. Even so radical a critic as Cornill thinks that the objections to 1:13 and 2:20-23 are insufficient and says that the book corresponds fully to the report of the work of Haggai in Ezra 5:1 and 6:14.

III. **Date.** The date of the book is universally conceded to have been 520 B.C. This date is derived from the precise statement of the prophet who mentions three different days on which he received the word of Jehovah, all in the second year of Darius. From the contents of the book this Darius was evidently Darius Hystaspis, who reigned 521-485 B.C. Thus Haggai's prophecies were given from September to December 520 B.C.

IV. **Author.** Scarcely anything concerning the life of Haggai is known. It has been conjectured by Ewald from 2:3 that he had seen the Solomonic temple before the Exile and Baudissin agrees that this supposition of the great age of the prophet would account for the simplicity of his style. Such a theory is plausible though 2:3 gives it very little confirmation. Zechariah was a contemporary of Haggai and they labored together in encouraging the people to rebuild the temple. Zechariah

probably outlived Haggai. According to the Talmud Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi were members of the Great Synagogue.

V. **History.** The Jews returned from the Exile by the decree of Cyrus in 536 B.C. They built the altar of God, offered sacrifices (Ezra 3:2-6; Hag. 2:14), and made preparations to build the temple (Ezra. 3:7-13). Immediately they encountered the opposition of the Samaritans, who, when refused the privilege of taking part in the work, complained of the Jews to Cyrus and by intrigue succeeded in hindering them (Ezra 4:5) until the reign of Darius. Faintheartedness and indifference concerning the work of rebuilding the temple arose among the Jews. They built ceiled houses for themselves but the house of God was still waste. When Darius came to the throne (521 B.C.) he had to meet two revolts of Babylon. This condition of affairs diverted his attention from distant Jerusalem. The decree of Cyrus remained unrepealed. Accordingly, Haggai and Zechariah urged Zerubbabel, the governor of Judah and Davidic heir to the throne, and Joshua the high-priest to continue the building (Ezra 3:1-2). Their work was successful. A new beginning was made and in four years and a half the temple was finished (Ezra 6:15). The prophecies of Haggai are confined to this one purpose of encouraging the building of the temple.

V. **Divisions.**

1. Prophecy on first day of sixth month. Chapter 1.
2. Prophecy on twenty-first day of seventh month. 2:1-9.
3. Two prophecies on twenty-fourth day of ninth month. 2:10-23.

(11) *Zechariah*

I. Name. The book is named from its author זְכַרְיָה meaning "whom Jehovah hath remembered." It was a very common name among the Jews being borne by no less than thirty other characters of the Old Testament. In the Septuagint the form is *Ζαχαρίας* and in the Vulgate Zacharias. The English form nearly reproduces the Hebrew.

II. Composition and Date.

A. *Critical Opinion.* That Zechariah was the author of chapters 1 to 8 is universally conceded. The genuineness of chapters 9-14 is however denied by the large majority of critics. These chapters together with the short book of Malachi are said by some to have been three anonymous sections which were added to the last of the Prophets. In defense of this view the similarity of the titles (Zech. 9:1; 12:1 and Mal 1:1) is mentioned. Others think that the author of chapters 9-11 and possibly also of chapters 12-14 was the Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah who was a contemporary of Isaiah (Is. 8:2) and that because of the similarity of name, his writings were added by the editor of the Minor Prophets to those of the post-exilic Zechariah, the son of Berechiah, the son of Iddo.

There is a radical difference among critics concerning the date and composition of chapters 9-14. With allowances for minor variations the two views may be summed up as follows:

1. Certain critics such as Baudissin and Strack still consider these chapters to be pre-exilic, chapters 9-11

with possibly 13:7-9 belonging to the end of the reign of Jeroboam II in the early part of Isaiah's ministry in Judah (Isa. 8:2) while chapters 12-14 possibly excepting 13:7-9 were composed in the reign of Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin or Zedekiah. The arguments for this view of chapters 9-11 are:—

(a) The mention of Hadrach, Damascus and Hamath as independent countries (9:1-2) marks a time before the conquest of those countries by Tiglath-Pileser in 733 B.C.

(b) The brotherhood between Judah and Israel (11:14) implies a time before the alliance of Israel and Syria against Judah in the reign of Ahaz.

(c) The mention of Egypt and Assyria together (Zech. 10:10-11) as in Hosea (7:11; 9:3; 11:11; 12:1) and Isaiah (7:18; 11:11) implies a time before the Exile.

(d) The reference to teraphim and diviners (Zech. 10:1-4) points to a pre-exilic date.

(e) The adherents of this view consider the reference to Javan (Zech. 9:13) a corruption of the text.

Their arguments concerning the date of chapters 12-14 are:

(a) The northern kingdom is not mentioned but Judah is represented as still ruled by the house of David (Zech. 12:7, 10, 12; 13:1).

(b) Idols are still worshipped (Zech. 13:2).

(c) False prophets are in the land (Zech. 13:2-6).

(d) "The mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddon" refers to the mourning for King Josiah (II Chron. 35:25).

2. Other critics such as Nowack and Driver assign chapters 9-14 to a post-exilic date.

Nowack divides these chapters into four parts.

(a) He assigns 9: (10: 1f) 10: 3 to 11: 3 to a time subsequent to Alexander the Great because of the mention of "the sons of Javan" (9: 13).

(b) Concerning 11: 4-17 and 13: 7-9 he is somewhat in doubt but considers it certainly post-exilic because of the dependence of 11: 16 on Ezek. 34.

(c) He says that 12: 1 to 13: 6 "lie upon the line of development whose culmination is indicated in views like those expressed in 1 Macc. 4: 46; 9: 27; 14: 41" (Hastings B. D. Vol. IV. p. 969). The arguments for this are the dependence of the campaign of the heathen against Jerusalem upon Ezek. 38, the mention of the houses of David and Levi together (12: 12) and the hostility to prophecy (13: 2-6).

(d) Chapter 14 is assigned to a late post-exilic period because of its relation to Ezek. 38, because verse 11 is said to be dependent upon Mal. 4: 6 and because of the ideas expressed in verses 16 and 20.

Driver places Zech. 9-11 and 13: 7-9 "after the overthrow of the Persian empire at Issus by Alexander the Great," (B.C. 333) chiefly because Greece is mentioned as a world-power and Israel's most important antagonist. In regard to chapters 12-14 (omitting 13: 7-9) Driver is not so certain though he suggests the periods between 518 and 458 B.C. and 432 and 300 B.C. where Jewish history is but little known.

In addition to these arguments against the genuineness of chapters 9-14 it is contended that their style differs widely from that of chapters 1-8. In particular Driver mentions the fact that the Deutero-Zechariah uses Zechariah's favorite expression, "thus saith the Lord" only once, while the expression "in that day,"

found 18 times in chapters 12-14, occurs only three times in chapters 1-8 and only twice in chapters 9-11. Chapters 1-8 are unpoetical in form while chapters 9-14 are poetical and abound in parallelism.

B. *Arguments for Unity of the book.*

(a) It is not necessary to devote much attention to the work of refuting the older view of the pre-exilic date, for the weight of authority favors the later date and the arguments cited from Nowack and Driver suffice to indicate a time after the Exile. The references to Hadrach, Damascus, and Hamath (9:1-2) and the cities of Phenicia are in a prophecy of the invasion of Alexander the Great in 333 B.C. as the allusion to Greece shows (9:13). Judah and Israel were considered as reunited after the Exile, for many of the northern kingdom returned with Judah and the sin-offering was made for all the twelve tribes (Ezra 6:17; 8:35). The house of Israel and the house of Judah are mentioned separately even in the portion of the book acknowledged as post-exilic (Zech. 8:13). The name Assyria is used after the Exile either as a geographical designation (Ezra 6:22) or, as Nowack suggests, as a name for Syria. Our knowledge of the times immediately after the return from the Exile does not justify the statement that teraphim, idols and false prophets were unknown. The references to the supremacy of the house of David are all predictive (Zech. 12:7, 10, 12; 13:1). "The mourning of Hadadrimmon" is not mentioned as a recent occurrence but as a well known event in the history of the people to which Jeremiah and the Chronicler refer (II Chron. 35:25). Furthermore if chapters 9-14 were composed before the time of the Exile, why do they say nothing of the Chaldeans

and their invasion of Judah, a subject which has so large a place in the writings of the pre-exilic Prophets?

(b) While the arguments of Nowack and Driver are sufficient to prove the post-exilic date, they do not prove a date after Zechariah. The dependence upon Ezekiel is quite as natural if Zechariah wrote these chapters as on the theory of a later date. Nor is it necessary to place chapters 9-11 after the invasion of Alexander in 333 B.C. because of the reference to Javan (Zech. 9:13). The passage is predictive and not historical. Javan was known to Israel long before Zechariah's time (Gen. 10:2, 4; Isa 66:19; Ezek. 27:13). And if we suppose that Zechariah wrote this prophecy thirty or forty years after those of chapters 1-8, we are brought to a time when the military prestige of Javan or Greece must have been known throughout the Persian empire. The defeat of Darius at Marathon in 490 B.C. and of the enormous armies of Xerxes at Thermopylae in 480 B.C. as well as the naval defeats at Salamis (480 B.C.), Plataea and Mycale (479 B.C.) were certainly calculated to make Greece a world-power in the view of the prophet.

(c) The differences in style between chapters 1-8 and 9-14 are explained by the difference of subject and the probable interval of thirty or forty years in the prophet's life. The predictions of chapters 9-14 require a different style from the visions of chapters 1-8. The early part of the book was meant to encourage Israel while building the temple but the latter part consists of woes upon the enemies of God's people and promises of blessing upon Israel. Therefore the reassuring "thus saith the Lord" is appropriate to the early but not to the later part of the book. The characteristic

mark of prediction "in that day" is rare in the early chapters because prediction is rare and common near the end of the book because that part is almost entirely predictive.

We would not expect many literary marks of a common authorship between prophecies so totally different in occasion and purpose—one uttered by a young and the other by an old man. Yet there are a few.

Chapter	9:9	compare.....	Chapter 2:10
"	9:10.....	"	Hag. 2:22
"	13:9	"	Chapter 8:8

Even more noteworthy is the usage of the Kal of יָשַׁב in the passive sense. This is found only three times outside of Zechariah (Ps. 125:1; Jer. 17:25; Isa. 13:20) but it occurs twice in the undisputed part of the book (2:8 and 7:7) and twice in the disputed part (12:6 and 14:10). The expression מֵעֲבֵר וּמֵשָׁב is also found in both sections of the prophecy (7:14 and 9:8).

III. **History** (see Haggai).

IV. **Author.** Zechariah was the son of Berechiah, the son of Iddo (1:1). The grandfather, Iddo, is mentioned because he was distinguished as one of the leaders of the Levites who returned with Zerubbabel and Joshua from exile (Neh. 12:1, 4, 7). If so Zechariah was himself a priest and identical with the Zechariah of Neh. 12:16. Iddo was probably an elderly man and Zechariah a child when they returned to Jerusalem in 536 B.C. Zechariah was a young man when he gave his first prophecy in the second year of Darius (520 B.C.) two months after the first prophecy of Haggai. Many think that Zech. 2:4 refers to the prophet's youth. After three months Zechariah received

another revelation (1:7) and a third over two years later (7:1). Thus the certain dates of his ministry are 520-518 B.C. It seems probable from the reference to Javan or Greece that he made the prophecies of chapters 8-14 much later, possibly 490-475 B.C. This theory would be possible, if Zechariah lived to be seventy years old (545-475 B.C.) and if his ministry extended over forty-five years (520-475 B.C.). In the beginning of his ministry Haggai was his contemporary prophet. Joshua was the high-priest and Zerubbabel the governor in his time. According to the Talmud, Zechariah was a member of the Great Synagogue.

V. **Divisions.**

1. Visions to encourage the rebuilding of the temple. Chapters 1-6.

2. Mission of inquiry concerning the continuance of the fasts commemorating the destruction of Jerusalem. Chapters 7-8.

3. Predictions, largely symbolical, concerning the future of Israel and their enemies. Chapters 9-14.

(12) *Malachi*

I. **Name.** The book is named from its author מַלְאָכִי meaning "my messenger" (Jehovah's messenger). Others think it an abbreviated form of מַלְאָכְיָה "messenger of Jehovah." Many critics following the Septuagint consider it a common noun. The Targum of Jonathan ben-Uzziel adds "whose name is called Ezra the scribe." According to the critical view the book was orginally anonymous but the title and name (1:1) were added by the editor of the Minor Prophets by reference to Mal. 3:1. The title in the Septuagint is *Μαλαχίας* and in the Vulgate Malachias. The English form of the name follows the Hebrew. The fact that every other book of the Minor Prophets opens with the name of its author makes it probable that Malachi is a proper name and not a mere title of the prophet.

II. **Date.** Although no date is given the approximate time of the book is evident. The temple was built and offerings were made (1:7, 10; 3:1). A Persian governor ruled in Jerusalem (1:8). Hence we look for a time after Haggai and Zechariah. The sins against which Malachi inveighs are similar to those in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah (compare Mal. 2:10-16 with Ezra 9:2; 10:3, 16-44; Neh. 10:30; 13:23-31 and Mal. 3:7-12 with Neh. 10:32-39; 13:4-14). Hence it is generally agreed that Malachi prophesied during the same period. Whether he did so before the arrival of Ezra in Jerusalem (458 B.C.) or about the time of Nehemiah's second visit (432 B.C.) there is much difference of opinion. The statement of 1:8

makes it improbable that Nehemiah was governor at the time the prophet wrote. The theory that the book was written during the absence of Nehemiah at Susa in 433-432 is the most probable. According to the Talmud Malachi was a member of the Great Synagogue.

III. **Composition.** The genuineness of the book is universally conceded. Many critics however consider the title in 1:1 a later addition. The similarity of the titles in Zech. 9:1; 12:1 and Mal. 1:1 has given support to the theory that Zech. 9-11, Zech. 12-14 and Malachi were originally three independent anonymous prophecies. The editor of the Minor Prophets is said to have placed the title, "burden of the word of Jehovah" at the head of Zech. 12-14 and of the book of Malachi in imitation of Zech. 9:1. He also joined the first two sections to Zechariah and made the third independent in order to obtain the desired number, twelve, in the Minor Prophets, and added the name Malachi in 1:1 in imitation of 3:1. The Septuagint and Targum of Jonathan ben-Uzziel make Malachi in 1:1 a common noun and the latter adds "whose name is called Ezra the scribe." The critical theory is too fanciful to require refutation. The name Malachi is properly formed like Abi for Abijah (II Kings 18:2). It is more natural to consider Mal. 3:1 a play upon the prophet's name than Mal. 1:1 an imitation of Mal. 3:1. The title, "Burden of the word of Jehovah," may well have been placed in Mal. 1:1 by the prophet himself in imitation of his predecessor, Zechariah. The Septuagint evidently was not sure that Malachi (1:1) was a common noun for it gave the proper name in the title. The tradition that Ezra wrote the book is

unlikely; for the book of Ezra bears no traces of his having done so.

IV. Divisions.

1. The apostasy of Israel described. Chapters 1-2.

2. Judgment for the sinners and blessings for the penitent. Chapters 3-4.

THIRD DIVISION

KETHUBHIM

Section I. Poetical Books

PRELIMINARY. HEBREW POETRY

I. **Spirit.** The Hebrew language is peculiarly adapted to be the vehicle of poetic expression. Its most prominent part of speech is the verb, the word of action. A large majority of its words are based upon metaphors and the simple structure of its vocabulary and its grammar lends itself to paronomasia and striking antithesis. Furthermore the great variety of landscape in the small land of Palestine and the emotional and even rapturous character of the people furnished at once the occasion and the power for the construction of poetry.

The poetry of the Old Testament is not preëminently descriptive of nature though incidentally this finds a large place in it. Nor is it preëminently individual or national, though these elements also are recognized. It is above all things religious. The spiritual God who punishes the wicked, pities the unfortunate, and keeps covenant with His people is the constant factor in Hebrew poetry. One can feel His divine presence throbbing in it all. Nature, history and individual experience are full of God. Hence this poetry can be appreciated fully only by the devout soul. As Herder expresses it: "As the heaven pictures itself only in the clear calm sea, so we see the gentle wave of emotion

describe its circles only in the tranquil soul." (Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, Vol. II p. 246). It is this religious characteristic which gives unity to Hebrew poetry and makes it interesting to all ages. Although the allusions to songs of the vintage (Isa. 16:10) wedding songs (Ps. 78:63) and the inscriptions of certain Psalms (e.g. Ps. 22:1) indicate that secular poetry was common among the Hebrews, it has no place in the Old Testament.

II. **Extent in the Old Testament.** It is difficult to set bounds to the poetic element of the Hebrew scriptures. The repetition and antithesis which are the foundation of parallelism, are characteristic of all Hebrew writing. In some places they are more marked than in others. Thus in the words of Adam at the creation of Eve (Gen. 2:23) and of God in condemnation of Cain (Gen. 4:10-11) parallelism is unmistakeable.

Occasional songs are introduced in the historical books:

The Song of the Sword (Lamech)	Gen. 4:23-24.
The Blessing of Jacob	Gen. 49:1-27.
The Song of Moses	Ex. 15:1-18.
The Song of the Well	Num. 21:17-18.
The Song of the War-Flame	Num. 21:27-30.
The Farewell Song of Moses	Deut. 32:1-43.
The Song of Deborah	Judges 5.
The Song of Hannah	I Sam. 2:1-10.
The Song of the Bow (Saul and Jonathan)	II Sam. 1:17-27.
The Last Words of David	II Sam. 23:1-7.

The books which are entirely in the poetic form are Psalms, Proverbs, Job (excepting the prologue and epilogue), Song of Solomon and Lamentations. Ecclesiastes is similar in many parts to the poetry of Proverbs. The books of the prophets abound in parallelism and in the more exalted portions may be classed as poetry. The prayer of Jonah (chapter 2), the prayer of Habakkuk (chapter 3) and possibly Nahum 1:2-8 are examples of pure poetry.

Thus the Old Testament is in marked contrast to the New in its large element of poetry. The Magnificat of Mary (Luke 1:46-55), the prophecy of Zacharias (Luke 1:68-77), the Beatitudes (Matt. 5:3-12) and certain passages of Revelation (4:8, 11; 5:9-10, 12, 13; 7:5-8, 12; 11:15; 15:3-4; 19:1-2, 5, 6-8) in the spirit of Hebrew poetry are the only original poetry in the New Testament. The quotations from Old Testament poetry and Paul's brief citations of the Greek poets, Aratus (Acts 17:28b) and Callimachus (Tit. 1:12) should not be classed here. The Old Testament on the other hand is largely poetic either in spirit or in form, often in both.

III. **Form.** Rhyme is not a distinguishing characteristic of Hebrew poetry, although something approaching it occurs occasionally (Job 10;9-18; Paslm 6). Nor is metre a mark of this poetry, although the similarity in the length of the lines and the different system of accents in Psalms, Proverbs and Job, make the search for a metrical arrangement attractive.

The unit of Hebrew poetry is the line, which varies in length in different kinds of poetry. Usually two lines constitute a verse, which is then called a distich. Tristichs are common and even tetrastichs and penta-

stichs occur (Ps. 27:3-4; 37:7, 14, 25, 28, 40). In tetrastichs the first two and the last two lines commonly go together.

The uniform and essential feature of Hebrew poetry has been called by Bishop Lowth the "parallelism." After a statement has been made in the first line of the verse, it is repeated, enlarged, or balanced by the statements of the remaining line or lines. Thus parallelism is "a manifest correspondence both in sense and rhythmic expression between two sentences or two sections of a sentence, very much as if it were an utterance and some intelligent echo of it" (Drysdale "Early Bible Songs" p. 18). This arrangement was peculiarly adapted to express the emotions in times of great feeling and since the poetry consists much more in the sense than in the sound of the words, Hebrew poetry suffers less than other poetry by translation.

Parallelism is of several different kinds.

1. Synonymous, in which the second line is a repetition of the thought of the first line (Gen. 4:23).

2. Antithetic, in which the second line expresses a thought contrasted with that of the first (Ps. 1:6).

3. Synthetic, in which the thought of the second and later lines enlarges upon and completes that of the first (Ps. 24:9).

4. Climactic, similar to synthetic, in which the thought ascends by steps to a climax (Ps. 29:1).

A larger division of Hebrew poetry, which can sometimes be distinguished, is the stanza or strophe. Usually it is marked only by a change of thought as in the fourfold division of Psalm 2 although each strophe of Psalm 46 ends with Selah. In the great majority of

Psalms, however, the strophes are uneven in length and often cannot be distinguished at all.

IV. **Kinds.** In the proper sense of the words, neither epic nor dramatic poetry is found in the Bible. The action which is essential to the drama is not found in the poetic portion of the Book of Job nor in the Song of Songs. Lyric and didactic poetry, however, are common. To the former class belong the occasional songs scattered throughout the historical and prophetic portions of the Old Testament and most of the Psalms. The books of Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes as well as several of the Psalms are didactic poetry. The Song of Songs like Psalm 45 is an epithalamium or marriage-song, and the Lamentations of Jeremiah and the Song of the Bow (II Sam. 1:17-27) are elegies.

I

PSALMS

I. **Name.** The Hebrew name of the entire collection of Psalms was סֵפֶר תְּהִלִּים sometimes shortened into תְּהִלִּים. This word occurs in the Old Testament only in the forms תְּהִלָּה and תְּהִלּוֹת (Ps. 22:3). The feminine plural refers to the subject-matter of the Psalms and the masculine to the form. The Septuagint translates תְּהִלִּים by *Ψαλμοί* which in the singular meant primarily the twanging with the fingers in playing on a stringed instrument, then the sound of the harp and finally a song sung to the harp. The Vulgate appropriates the Greek name (Liber Psalmorum) from which also our English name is derived. Individual Psalms are called by several different names and some critics think that תְּפִלּוֹת in Ps. 72:20 is meant to be a designation of the entire collection, so far as it was completed. This name however is too restricted for that purpose nor does the passage refer to all the Psalms before it.

II. **Arrangement and Divisions.** In the Massoretic text there are 150 Psalms. The Septuagint and Vulgate unite Psalms 9 and 10, and 114 and 115, and divide Psalms 116 and 147. Psalms 42 and 43 are counted together in several Hebrew manuscripts. The Septuagint adds another Psalm to the 150 with the inscription: "This Psalm was written by David outside of the number when he fought against Goliath." It is undoubtedly spurious.

The Psalter is arranged in five books, probably in imitation of the five books of the Pentateuch. Each book ends with a doxology and Psalm 150 is the doxology for the entire collection. This division antedates the Septuagint and is indicated by headings in the Hebrew Bible. It is as follows:

Book 1.....	Psalms	1-41
" 2.....	"	42-72
" 3.....	"	73-89
" 4.....	"	90-106
" 5.....	"	107-150

III. **Authors.** Of the 150 Psalms, 100 are assigned by their inscriptions to authors as follows:

David: Psalms 3-9, 11-32, 34-41, 51-65, 68-70, 86, 101, 103, 108-110, 122, 124, 131, 133, 138-145 (73 in all).

Sons of Korah: Psalms 42, 44-49, 84-85, 87, 88 (Psalm 88 is assigned to Heman, one of the Sons of Korah—11 in all).

Asaph: Psalms 50, 73-83 (12 in all).

Solomon: Psalms 72, 127.

Ethan: Psalm 89.

Moses: Psalm 90.

Three things should be remembered concerning these inscriptions.

1. They are not a part of the original text of the Psalms. They were however added at a period before the Septuagint as is evidenced by their presence in that version.

2. The names are introduced by the preposition ל instead of the older genitive giving rise to discussions whether the name is that of the traditional author or

of the one to whom the Psalm is dedicated or of the collection or hymn-book to which the Psalm originally belonged. The last two theories are objectionable. If there were hymn-books named after Moses, Solomon, Ethan and Heman, it is strange indeed that so few Psalms have been kept from them. Ancient Hebrew tradition referred these titles to the authors. In the inscriptions of several Davidic Psalms (3, 7, 18, 30, 34, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, 63, and 142) there is the mention of some well-known occasion of David's life, indicating that the writer of the inscription meant to give the name of the author and the occasion of his writing the Psalm. Psalm 18 is said to have been composed by David in the inscription as well as in II Sam. 22, although in the Psalter the inscription is לְדָוִד. If ל in the inscriptions of these fourteen Psalms evidently meant authorship, the presumption is that the meaning is the same in all cases.

3. Since the authorship of individual Psalms is a matter which it is impossible to determine with anything approaching certainty, it is best to accept this very ancient though uninspired tradition, unless strong internal evidence is found against it. In many instances the Psalms agree with known occasions in the life of the traditional author. When this is not the case, it is safe to conclude that the Psalm refers to an occasion in his life which the brief records of the historical books do not mention. In a few instances the inscription should be rejected.

The traditional view that David was the author of many Psalms is supported by the following considerations:

1. He played upon the harp (I Sam. 16:18-23; II

Sam. 6:5) and is called "the sweet singer of Israel" (II Sam. 23:1).

2. He composed certain songs (II Sam. 1:17-27; 22:1-51; 23:1-7).

3. He arranged the service of song in the sanctuary (I Chron. 6:31; 16:7; 25:1; Ezra 3:10; Neh. 12:24, 36, 45-46; Amos 6:5).

It is indeed extraordinary if the high musical reputation of David rests upon no broader foundation than the composition of the three songs in II Samuel.

The Psalms ascribed to the sons of Korah, to Asaph, to Heman, and to Ethan are 24 and properly are classed together since their authors were associated with the service of song which David established. Korah was probably a descendant of the man of that name who was swallowed up by the earth because of rebellion (Num. 16:1) and hence of Kohath, one of the three sons of Levi. Heman was one of the sons of Korah, Asaph was a descendant of Gershom (I Chron. 6:39) and Ethan of Merari (I Chron. 6:44). Hence the three sons of Levi were represented among the temple singers (Ex. 6:16). Asaph, Heman and Ethan (who was later called Jeduthun) were appointed to sing and sound the cymbals when David brought up the ark to Zion (I Chron. 15:16-19) and afterwards to be the leaders of the orchestra (I Chron. 16:5, 7, 41-42; 25:1-5). Many of the descendants of Asaph returned from Babylon (Ezra 2:41; Neh. 7:44) and took part in the laying of the foundation of Zerubbabel's temple (Ezra 3:10). This long record in connection with the musical worship shows that the ascription of Psalms to these three singers and to sons of Korah is reliable.

There is nothing in Psalms 72 and 127 which pre-

cludes the possibility that Solomon wrote them especially in view of his reputation as the builder of the temple. And though the inscription of Psalm 90 to Moses assigns it to an age long before the greater part of the Psalter, the majestic character of that Psalm is not inconsistent with the style of Moses. He too is known to have been a poet (Ex. 15; Deut. 32).

IV. **Collections.** The way in which the Psalter took its present form is very difficult to discover. Yet from the division into books, the grouping of Psalms by certain authors and of certain kinds, and especially from the statement of Ps. 72:20, it is evident that several earlier collections preceded the present one.

Driver and others have drawn attention to the *use of the divine names* in the Psalms. In Book I Jehovah is found 272 times and Elohim 15 times, and in books IV and V Jehovah only is found except in Ps. 114:9 and five places of Psalm 108 derived from Psalms 57 and 60. On the other hand in Book II Jehovah occurs 30 times and Elohim 164 times while in the Asaphitic Psalms of Book III (73-83) Jehovah is found 13 times and Elohim 36 times and in Psalms 84-89 Jehovah occurs 31 times and Elohim 7 times. This usage is partly due to authorship and partly to subject. David commonly uses the name Jehovah while Asaph and the Sons of Korah use the name Elohim. It is noteworthy however that in the last two books which are largely liturgical, the name Jehovah is used almost to the exclusion of Elohim. At any rate there is nothing in these facts which indicates a redaction of the Psalms to introduce another divine name.

Three collections can be distinguished.

1. Since all the Psalms in Book I are Davidic except

the introductory Psalm I, the probably Davidic Psalm 2, Psalm 10 which may have originally been part of Psalm 9, and Psalm 33 which in the Septuagint is ascribed to David, it seems likely that this book was arranged for worship by David himself or soon after his time.

The suggestion of Ewald that originally Psalms 51-72 followed immediately after Psalm 41 is commended by the fact that it would bring together a much larger body of Davidic Psalms and so account for the statement of Ps. 72:20 and also would unite the Korahitic and Asaphitic into a group by themselves. It is altogether probable that Ps. 72 once stood as the last Psalm in a collection which was joined to Book I not long after David's time.

2. The remainder of Books II and III were probably brought together either by the men of Hezekiah (II Chron. 29:30; Prov. 25:1) or during the reforms instituted by Josiah.

3. Books IV and V contain post-exilic Psalms together with a few old Davidic Psalms. They were probably collected to complete the Psalter in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. The evidence deduced to show that there are Maccabean Psalms is altogether fanciful and insufficient. The allusions of these Psalms are explained equally well by a much earlier date.

V. **Classes of Psalms.** The Psalms may be classified according to their inscriptions, their structure or their subject matter. These classifications however do not include all the Psalms.

1. *According to the Inscriptions* we have the following names for the Psalms:

מִזְמוֹר found in the inscriptions of 57 Psalms. From

זָמַר to pipe, sing—hence Psalm, especially one sung to music. Of these Psalms, 11 are also designated שִׁיר and one (Psalm 88) שִׁיר and מַשְׂכִּיל. This seems to imply that מִזְמוֹר is the general name.

שִׁיר the usual word for a song (Ex. 15:1; Num. 21:17; Deut. 32:44 etc.) is the name of 29 Psalms, of which 15 (Psalms 120-134) are called שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת ("song of ascents") which were sung by the pilgrims on their way to the feasts at Jerusalem, one (Psalm 30) שִׁיר חֲנֻכַּת הַבַּיִת for the dedication of the tabernacle on Mt. Zion, and one (Psalm 45) שִׁיר יְדִידוֹת ("song of love") a marriage song. The name שִׁיר does not imply the use of musical instruments.

מַשְׂכִּיל a name found in the inscriptions of 13 Psalms, of which one is also תְּפִלָּה (Psalm 142) one מִזְמוֹר (Psalm 88) and two שִׁיר (Psalms 45 and 88). The etymological meaning, "a didactic Psalm," does not fit some of those to which it is prefixed. It probably means "a poem."

מִכְתָּם the name of six Psalms. The derivation of this word from כֶּתֶם "gold"—hence "a golden Psalm"—is altogether fanciful. Its meaning is unknown.

תְּפִלָּה the usual word for prayer, is borne by five Psalms.

תְּהִלָּה the word which in the masculine plural has given the name to the Book of Psalms, is found in the inscription of Psalm 145. It means "a praise-song."

שִׁגָּיוֹן the name of Psalm 7, has not received a satisfactory interpretation.

2. *According to structure* the most interesting class of Psalms is the Alphabetic or acrostic Psalms, in which the order of the Hebrew alphabet is found at the beginning of the verses or half verses. The only perfect alphabetic Psalm is the 119th in which each group of verses begins with the successive letters of the alphabet. In Psalms 111 and 112 the first letters of the half verses give the alphabet except that in each Psalm the letters ע and ש are lacking, unless verses 9 and 10 be divided into three parts. In Psalm 145 one verse is devoted to each letter except that נ is lacking. In Psalm 25 the same arrangement is followed except that the letters ב, ו, and ק are lacking, ר is repeated, and a supplementary verse is added. Psalm 34 is perfect except for the omission of ו and the addition of a similar supplementary verse. Psalms 9-10 together and Psalm 37 present an alphabetic arrangement in some parts, with two verses beginning with each letter, while in other parts this arrangement is ignored. The wide diffusion of the alphabetic Psalms in the Psalter (9, 10, 25, 34, 37, 111, 112, 119, 145) and the evident antiquity of some of them are sufficient refutation of the theory that this arrangement is evidence of a late date, when the spontaneity of poetry had given place to a more formal method.

3. *According to their contents* several groups of Psalms are worthy of attention.

A. National Psalms, those which were occasioned by the events of national life. Such are Psalms 14, 44, 46-48, 53, 66, 68, 74, 76, 79-80, 83, 85, 87, 108, 122, 124-126 and 129. The tendency of modern interpretation is largely to increase the number of these Psalms making the "I" of the Psalmist refer as a collective to the

experiences of the nation. Many of the Psalms are so intensely individual in the expression of personal feeling that such an interpretation is forced and unnatural.

B. Historical Psalms, which rehearse passages from the nation's history. Such are Psalms 78, 81, 105-106, 114.

C. Royal Psalms, some of them relating to the Messianic King. Such are Psalms 2, 18, 20-21, 45, 72, 89, 110 and 132.

D. Penitential Psalms, written in reference to some occasion of intense sorrow for sin and turning to God. Such are Psalms 6, 32, 38, 51 and 130.

E. Imprecatory Psalms, which call down maledictions upon the enemies of Israel. The principal of these are Psalms 35, 69, 109 and 137 of which the first three are David's. In explanation of them the following considerations should be noted.

(*a*) The expressions are not individual but official. The Psalmist desires the punishment of those who have wasted Israel, the visible kingdom of God and hence are God's enemies (Ps. 139:21-22). David was not vindictive toward his personal enemies but exhibited a remarkably forgiving spirit in regard to Saul and his house (I Sam. 24; 26:5-12; II Sam. 1:17; 2:5; 9). In these Psalms he prays God to punish his enemies rather than doing so himself.

(*b*) In the time of the Psalmists, there was no clear revelation of the punishment of the wicked after death. Punishment was thought of as coming in this present life. The most awful of these imprecations are not more terrible than the future torments of the wicked mentioned in the New Testament (Mark 9:44, 46, 48; Rev. 20:15).

(*c*) The high standard of love toward one's enemies was not yet revealed (Matt. 5:38-42). The imprecatory Psalms contain expressions more realistic and vivid in their force than any in the New Testament because the Psalmists lived on a lower plane of morals and privilege than we enjoy. Yet the New Testament denunciations of the wicked, though less physical, are far more terrible than those of the Old Testament (Matt. 3:7; 11:20-24; 23:13-33; Jno. 3:36; Rev. 6:16-17).

F. Hallelujah Psalms, such as begin with הַלְלוּיָהּ. Such are Psalms 106, 111-113, 117, 135, 146-150.

G. Hodu Psalms, beginning with הוֹדוּ, Psalms of thanksgiving, viz., Psalms 105, 107, 118, 136.

H. The Hallel, comprising Psalms 113-118 which were sung at the Passover, the Feast of Tabernacles, Pentecost, Dedication and the new moons. At the Passover the people sang the first verse of each Psalm in the Hallel and responded with Hallelujah after each verse was sung by the Levites. The hymn sung at the institution of the Lord's Supper was probably the Hallel (Matt. 26:30; Mk. 14:26).

VI. **Musical Terms.**

לַמְנַצֵּחַ "to the chief musician," the leader of the choir. The instructions in the inscriptions were intended for his guidance.

נְגִינוֹת (also used in the singular נְגִינַת) means stringed instruments.

הַנְּחִילוֹת "wind instruments.

הַשְּׁמִינִית probably "the octave."

עֲלָמוֹת "maidens," to be sung by maidens (I Chron. 15:20).

מָחֲלַת "sickness, grief"—hence to a mournful tune.

עַל־הַגִּתִּית (II Sam. 15:18)
עַל מוּת לַבֵּן
עַל־אַיֶּלֶת הַשַּׁחַר
עַל שׁוֹשַׁן
עַל־שׁוֹשַׁנִּים (Ps. 60:1; 80:1)
עַל־יוֹנַת אֵלֶם רְחֹקִים
אַל תַּשְׁחֵת

} The names or first lines of the melodies to which the Psalms were sung.

סֶלָה is derived from סָלַל, hence "elevation." It probably marks a change from piano to forte.

II

PROVERBS

I. **Name.** The book is named in the Hebrew Bible מִשְׁלֵי שְׁלֹמֹה or more briefly מִשְׁלֵי. A מָשָׁל is primarily a comparison, but since the most common form of proverbs is by comparison, all proverbs are called by this name. A proverb is a sententious, synthetic or antithetic statement of a principle which covers many cases. Though many of the proverbs of Solomon are religious, in the main they are maxims of worldly wisdom and ethics. They belong to the חָכְמָה or Wisdom Literature. In the Septuagint the title is translated *Παροιμίαι Σολομῶντος* and in the Vulgate more simply Liber Proverbiorum. The English name is derived from the Vulgate.

II. **Divisions.** The book is divided by its headings and subject matter into five parts:

1. Chapters 1-9 beginning "The proverbs of Solomon the son of David, king of Israel."

2. Chapters 10:1 to 22:16, with the heading "The Proverbs of Solomon."

3. Chapters 22:17 to 24:34 is marked off from the previous section by an evident resumption of the consecutive style.

4. Chapters 25-29 with the heading "These are also proverbs of Solomon which the men of Hezekiah, king of Judah, copied out."

5. Chapters 30-31, the former inscribed "the words

of Agur, the son of Jakeh" and the latter "the words of King Lemuel."

III. **Authorship and Composition.**

1. *Testimony of Scripture.* According to the headings already mentioned Solomon was the author of chapters 1 to 25 since the third section (22:17 to 24:34) resembles the first (1 to 9). The fourth section is not said to have been composed by the men of Hezekiah but copied out (הֶעְתִּיקוּ). This expression implies that they took these proverbs from a collection of Solomon's sayings and added them to this book. Thus the entire book except the last two chapters is ascribed to Solomon. These two chapters were the work of Agur and Lemuel respectively. That Solomon was the author of Proverbs is further attested by the explicit statement of I Kings 4:32 that "he spake three thousand proverbs." If this view be correct we may conclude that the book represents four distinct collections of Solomon's proverbs, the last made in Hezekiah's day but from ancient material, to which at an unknown later time chapters 30-31 were added. There is nothing in the book opposed to this explanation of its origin.

2. *Critical Opinion.*

a. Moderate view. Modern criticism has formulated a different account of the book although with wide divergence as to dates. The moderate critics acknowledge that Solomon may have written a considerable portion of 10:1 to 22:16, which is considered the oldest nucleus of the book. This section received its present form about the eighth century. It is said that 1:1 is not a heading but the beginning of a sentence speaking of the value of Solomon's proverbs. Chapters 1-9 are considered a hortatory introduction which was

prefixed to the second section shortly before the Exile. A little later but also before the Exile, 22:17 to 24:34 was added and possibly at the same time chapters 25-29. Chapters 30-31 were added to the book after the Exile. Such in general is the opinion of Driver, Delitzsch, Nowack, and Davidson.

b. Radical view. The more advanced critics agree in general with this account of the gradual compilation of the book but place the dates much later. Toy for example thinks that the oldest section came from about 350 B.C. and that the closing chapters were not added until the second century B.C.

1. He freely rejects the authorship of Solomon with the words: "The fact that he is said to be the author of Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes and Psalms 72 and 127 shows that the Jewish tradition came to regard him as the ideal of wisdom and a writer of idealizing, non-liturgical poetry and ascribed to him indiscriminately everything of this sort" (International Crit. Com. pp. xix-xx).

Answer.—Such an argument as this would make it impossible for a man to write several books of the same kind. It has no historical basis and inverts the logical order. Solomon could not have had such a reputation unless he had written just such books as these. The books were not assigned to him because he had the reputation but he gained the reputation by writing the books.

2. The tacit assumption of monotheism implies a time after the Exile.

Answer.—The Proverbs are not of such a sort that idolatry would be condemned if it were in existence. The book is moral rather than religious. In part of Solomon's reign the country was comparatively free

from idolatry. In all probability, Solomon wrote these proverbs before his damaging intercourse with heathen nations.

3. There is a lack of national traits implying that the people were scattered, under Persian and Greek domination, as after the Exile.

Answer.—Admittedly there are almost no historical marks in the book. Therefore the absence of marks of an early period no more indicates a late date than the absence of marks of a late date is proof of an early date. If left to the historical marks, we could not determine the date at all. The book is individual rather than national.

4. The book reflects the social manners and vices which existed after the Exile especially in the cities.

Answer.—There is evidence from the Book of Kings that Solomon's time was by no means free from those same vices.

5. There are evidences of the influence of the Greek philosophy—especially in the identification of knowledge and virtue. Hence it must date from a time later than the conquests of Alexander.

Answer.—The book is not philosophical but practical. The traces of the Greek philosophy are purely imaginary and may be explained as the inspired words of Solomon.

6. The book is evidently the work of a distinct caste of "wise men" who also composed Jesus Sirach, the Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiastes.

Answer.—The supposition of a caste of wise men implies a founder. As the Prophets are incomprehensible without Moses and the other Psalmists without David, so the later wisdom literature is incomprehensible without Solomon. A caste of wise men seem

to have existed besides the priest and prophets at least as early as Jeremiah (18:18). It is a gratuitous assumption to force all that literature into one age. The fact that Ecclesiastes and the Book of Wisdom were wrongly assigned to Solomon shows that he was considered the founder and greatest member of that school of writers.

III

JOB

I. **Name.** The book received its name from its principal character אִיּוֹב which in the Septuagint has the form *Ἰώβ* and in the Vulgate Liber Job. The name means "he who turns to God." The English has come from the Vulgate and does not reproduce the Hebrew.

II. **Historicity.** It is admitted that Job was a real character in popular tradition even by those who deny the historicity of the events recorded in the book. A common view is that there was a real character whose name was Job and who was a great sufferer, that an Israelitish writer made that character the basis of this poetic and philosophical discussion of the problem of human suffering.

The existence of Job and his wide reputation for piety is evidenced by Ezekiel's reference to him with Noah and Daniel as a model of righteousness (Ezek. 14:14-20). The reference in James 5:11 favors the same view. A careful study of the book itself does not show it a work of the imagination. The characters do not bear symbolic names. It has been attempted to derive אִיּוֹב from אָיַב in the meaning "the afflicted one," but אָיַב means "to be hostile to, treat as an enemy" (Brown's Lexicon). The better derivation is from Arabic "he who turns to God." The names of the three friends, of Elihu, and of Job's three daughters

(Job 42:14) are not symbolic. The land of Uz was known to Jeremiah (Lam. 4:21) and the tribe of that name is mentioned in Genesis (10:23; 22:21; 36:28). It was east of Palestine near Edom. The historical character of the prologue and epilogue seems to indicate the historical basis of the poetical portion. The most likely conclusion is that according to a reliable tradition Job's three friends contended with him in his affliction presenting the arguments which we have in the book. Elihu followed and finally God himself spoke to Job in some wonderful way from the whirlwind. The author gave these speeches the poetical form in which they have come down to us.

III. **Theme.** The subject of the book is the most profound question of human life, the question of theodicy, how the existence of righteous suffering in the world can be reconciled with the existence of a benevolent and all-powerful God. The arguments on this question are greatly enhanced in value because they are based upon an actual example of a righteous man in affliction. The hint of the solution of the problem is in the scene in heaven in the prologue.

The three friends present substantially the same opinion, that suffering must always be the result of sin. Job is unable to answer their arguments satisfactorily, yet he protests his innocence. Sometimes in his despair he longs to die, and charges God with dealing unjustly with him, and at others he resorts to bitter sarcasm in answering the friends. Again he expresses his confidence that light will come at last into the darkness and that he will be vindicated. Elihu enters with an entirely different theory of suffering, that God sends it upon those he loves for their chastening and better-

ment. This view silences the friends but also condemns Job for charging God with injustice. It is a defense of God (36:2) and therefore logically introduces the address of God himself. This final address displays the majesty and wisdom of God and the littleness of man. It humbles Job and thus becomes the means of his restoration to prosperity.

The Book of Job is incomparably the most profound and dramatic presentation of this problem in all literature. Its proper solution of the question in the abstract brings it very near to the New Testament solution in real life. The righteous sufferer, Job, foreshadows the righteous sufferer, Christ, and the increased blessings resulting from Job's sufferings foreshadow the incalculable blessings which result from the sufferings of Christ. This view is substantiated by the statement of Jas. 5:11.

Franz Delitzsch has well said: "The real contents of the book of Job is the mystery of the Cross: the Cross of Golgotha is the solution of the enigma of every cross; and the book of Job is a prophecy of this final solution" (Commentary Vol. i p. 32).

IV. **Divisions.** Prologue. Chapters 1 and 2.

1. First cycle of addresses, beginning with Job followed by each one of the three friends, each in turn answered by Job. Chapters 3-14.

2. Second cycle of addresses, in which each friend addresses Job and is answered by him in turn. Chapters 15-21.

3. Third cycle of addresses, in which Eliphaz speaks at length, Bildad very briefly and Zophar not all. They are answered by Job who continues the argument at considerable length. Chapters 22-31.

4. Argument of Elihu. Chapters 32-37.
5. Jehovah speaks. Chapters 38-41.
Epilogue. Chapter 42.

V. **Date and authorship.** Two distinct questions of date arise in connection with this book, the date of the events recorded in the book and the date of its authorship.

1. *Date of the events.* All the data concerning the time of Job mark it as very early, not later than the time of Moses. The family life as depicted in the prologue, the extensive ownership of cattle, the offering of the sacrifice by the head of the family, and the great age to which Job lived point unmistakably to patriarchal times. The mention of the קְשִׂיטָה (Job 42:11), a piece of money spoken of elsewhere only in patriarchal times (Gen. 33:19; Josh. 24:32) points in the same direction. Furthermore the comparative absence of allusions to the Mosaic law or the national history of Israel presupposes a time before the founding of the nation. On the other hand the fact that Job lived outside of Israel might account for his silence concerning its law and history without the supposition of an early date. And the fact that patriarchal life continued in these eastern countries much later than in Canaan and in many places even to the present day, makes the supposition of a pre-Mosaic date on this account unnecessary. Yet the probable date of the book requires a date for the events at least before Solomon.

2. *Date of the book.* This is somewhat easier to determine though there has been a wide divergence of opinion. The book has been assigned by different critics to four different periods.

A. *Patriarchal.* This view advocated by the Talmud and in modern times by Ebrard rests mainly on the points already mentioned which seem to place the man Job in very early times. It is assumed that it was written in Job's time, by Job himself, by Elihu or by Moses. This opinion is not held by any recent authorities and requires no refutation. It is affirmed by Driver, Davidson and others that certain signs of an acquaintance with the Mosaic law can be detected in the book. Such are the mention of pledges (24:9), of landmarks, (24:2) and of judicial procedure in cases of adultery (31:9) and of the worship of the sun and moon (31:26). These references however shed no light upon the date of the book, since similar laws existed before Moses and the worship of the sun and moon is abhorrent to the pure monotheism of Job even without any legal prohibition. The real argument against the patriarchal date is found in the book itself considered as a part of the Wisdom Literature.

B. Solomonic. This view advocated by Luther and more recently by Franz Delitzsch and others is the most satisfactory. The time of Solomon was one when the deepest practical questions of life engaged the thought of the wise. The Proverbs of Solomon in parts move in the same circle of ideas as Job. The prominence given to "wisdom" (15:8 and chapter 28) is very similar to Proverbs 8. The masterly and original way in which the questions of "wisdom" are dealt with in the Book of Job precludes the idea of a late date when the wisdom literature had become formal and imitative (Jesus Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon). Delitzsch rightly says concerning the book: "It bears throughout the stamp of that creative, beginning period of the Chokma,

—of that Solomonic age of knowledge and art, of deeper thought respecting revealed religion, and of intelligent progressive culture of the traditional forms of art,—that unprecedented age, in which the literature corresponds to the summit of glorious magnificence to which the kingdom of the promise had then attained" (Commentary p. 21). The wide knowledge of foreign nations displayed in the book also confirms the Solomonic date. Whether Solomon was himself the author or another writer of his time, it is fruitless to speculate.

C. The seventh century B.C., shortly after the fall of the northern kingdom, possibly in the reign of Manasseh. This view was maintained by Ewald and Hitzig. The principal arguments for it are the assertion that in that time as in the Book of Job the questions of providence were subjected to doubt, and the evidences of widespread misfortune (Job 3:20; 7:1; 9:24; 12:6; 24:12).

Answer.—The former of these arguments is no criterion of date. It is difficult to see why an age like Solomon's which reflected so profoundly on the problems of daily life should not have carried their thought into the region of divine providence. Concerning the latter argument it is noteworthy that all the passages referred to are in the speeches of Job. They do not indicate any more widespread misfortune than can be found in any age but rather were elicited by the misfortunes of Job himself and his observation that the wicked often prosper. The latter fact is most often exemplified in just such times of splendor and luxury as were those of Solomon. The misfortune of the Book of Job is not national but individual.

D. The time of the Exile, shortly before or shortly after it, 600-400 B.C. This is the prevailing view today, defended by Budde, Driver, Davidson and Cheyne while Cornill fixes the date not earlier than 250 B.C. The arguments as summarized by Davidson are:

1. "The extremely developed form both of the morality and the doctrine of God in the book;

2. The points of contact which it presents with Jeremiah and the ideas of his age; and

3. The strange parallel existing between Job and the "Servant of the Lord" in the second part of Isaiah (Commentary, p. lxiv).

Answer.—There is no evidence in the book of a morality or doctrine of God more highly developed than they were in the time of Solomon. Surely the ethics and theology of the Davidic Psalms and the Proverbs do not fall below that of Job. Furthermore the isolated character of the patriarch Job makes him comparable to Melchizedek in his moral and religious superiority to the men of his time. The points of contact with Jeremiah are accounted for by Jeremiah's acquaintance with the book. The parallel between Job and the "Servant of Jehovah" in Isaiah is only the parallel between a suffering individual and a suffering nation. Both point to the righteous sufferer in the New Testament but quite independently of each other.

VI. **Composition.**

Many critics, even those with radical tendencies, defend the integrity of the book by the evident artistic plan of its arrangement. Others with equal confidence affirm that certain parts were later additions.

1. The speeches of Elihu (chapters 32-37) are con-

sidered a later insertion by the majority of modern critics. The principal arguments are that Elihu is not mentioned in the prologue or the epilogue, that he does not differ from the three friends and therefore has no purpose in the book, that his speeches interrupt the course of the poem since Jehovah answers Job not Elihu (38:1) and that his style is inferior to the remainder of the book.

Answer.—Elihu is not mentioned in the prologue because he did not enter the discussion until a later stage than the three friends. He is not mentioned in the epilogue because his purpose as the forerunner of Jehovah was accomplished. It is not true that Elihu's view of Job's case is the same as that of the friends. On the contrary it was just because of their error that he spoke (32:3-12). While he condemns Job for charging God with injustice, he yet desires to justify him (33:32). He does not discuss the question of righteous suffering so much as prepare the way by his description of God's majesty for Jehovah's speech from the storm. Indeed Elihu's speeches belong just where they are because he sees the storm gathering (chapter 37). Davidson admits that Elihu exhibits no knowledge of the explanation of Job's sufferings in the prologue as he would have done if the whole book had been before him. Jehovah answers Job rather than Elihu because Job was the central figure, while there is nothing in Elihu's speeches to condemn. Without the speeches of Elihu the answer from the storm would be abrupt. Those who affirm that the style of Elihu is inferior to that of the remainder of the book are compelled to admit many points of contact between it and them. Driver considers the Elihu speeches "a valua-

ble supplement to" the book and says: "They attach prominence to real and important truths which in the rest of the book might seem not to have received their proper due" (Introduction p. 430).

2. Chapters 27:7 through 28 are thought by Wellhausen, Kuenen, Cheyne and others to be out of place in their present position in the book.

a. The description of the certain misfortune of the wicked in 27:7-23 is said to be a sudden break from verse 6 and unnatural in the mouth of Job since Zophar had already expressed similar sentiments in chapter 20. Some consider it a part of Bildad's speech or a third speech of Zophar.

Answer.—A careful reading of verse 7 makes the whole passage plain. Job's three friends have now proved themselves his enemies. In his despair, he wishes that they may be punished for their hostility toward him. "Let mine enemy be as the wicked and he that riseth up against me as the unrighteous." The following description of the fate of the wicked is meant to refer to his friends, not to himself. In view of the continued affirmation of his own righteousness, Job evidently had an expectation of his final restoration as in the epilogue.

b. The beautiful description of the search for wisdom in chapter 28 is said to break the connection with chapter 27 and form no fitting introduction to chapter 29 and to be altogether strange in Job's mouth in view of his previous language and the laments of chapter 31.

Answer.—The כִּי with which chapter 28 opens is indeed somewhat difficult to explain. It should be taken in connection with the statements of verse 12 and later.

Job has been describing the coming punishment of his friends. They thought that wisdom was found with them. On the contrary Job says, "For there is a mine for silver and a place for gold which they refine—but where shall wisdom be found and where is the place of understanding?" Chapter 29 makes a new beginning and it is therefore unnecessary to find a connection with chapter 28. The statements of chapter 28 are not more inconsistent with the other speeches of Job than the hopeful confidence of 19:26-27 and later passages. Harassed by his disease and by the specious arguments of his friends, Job always maintains his righteousness but hovers between hope and despair. Chapter 28 seems to have been uttered in one of his calmer moments. The laments of chapter 31 were the result of a new outburst of despair.

3. Cheyne thinks the prologue and epilogue later additions because they are prose and because the epilogue represents Job as rewarded in earthly blessings for his righteousness, "a sad concession to a low view of providential dealings" (Job and Solomon p. 69).

Answer.—Without the prologue and epilogue the book and its problem are entirely insoluble. The explanation of Job's sufferings is found in the scene in heaven in the prologue and without the epilogue Job is left unrewarded and the friends unpunished. The fact that Job's restoration is earthly and physical is made necessary by the fact that his sufferings had been of the same kind and that no other kind of reward was known to saints in his time.

4. Cheyne also rejects the speeches of the Almighty (chapters 38-41) and especially the description of

behemoth (40:15 to 41:34) as a disturbing element in the book and the latter as in bad taste.

Answer.—Questions of literary taste cannot be allowed to disturb the integrity of a book. If these speeches of Jehovah from the storm are removed the book has no climax, its problem is left unsolved, and its most beautiful section is lost.

SECTION II: MEGILLOTH

I

SONG OF SOLOMON

I. Name. The Hebrew name שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים (the Song of Songs) is derived from the first verse of the book and is a superlative, meaning that among all songs this one contains all that is best and noblest. The Septuagint translates the name ᾆσμα ᾀσμάτων, and the Vulgate Canticum Canticorum. From the latter come the English name Canticles and the name in the English Revision, "The Song of Songs," while that in the Authorized and American Revised Version is "The Song of Solomon."

II. Authorship and Date.

1. *Testimony of the Book.* According to the inscription Solomon was the author, for here as in the inscriptions of the Psalms ל indicates authorship. An examination of the book itself confirms the Solomonic authorship. The frequent mention of exotic plants and the extensive knowledge of plants and animals as well as the evidences of royal luxury agree with the description of Solomon's time in the historical books. The book also has points of contact with the other works of Solomon (Ps. 72 and Prov.).

2. *Critical Opinion.* Driver and others favor a date somewhat later than Solomon while Kuenen, Cornill, and Cheyne assign the Song to the Greek period.

The arguments for the latter position are chiefly as follows:

A. The superscription contains the form אֲשֶׁר while the shorter שֶׁ is found elsewhere throughout the book. It is thought therefore that the superscription was a later addition because of the frequent mention of Solomon in the book. Some critics affirm that it should be translated "which relates to Solomon."

Answer.—That the ל here means authorship is evident from the analogy of the Psalms. The relative אֲשֶׁר is appropriate to the prose of the superscription and the shorter שֶׁ to the poetry of the Song. Without this heading the book opens very abruptly.

B. Several late words and forms are found in the book: the shorter relative שֶׁ, פַּרְדֵּס a Persian word, אַפִּרְיוֹן connected with the Indian 'paryama' or the Greek φορεῖον and the Aramaic נְטַר, בְּרוֹת and סְתָו.

Answer.—The presence of these words is not inconsistent with the Solomonic authorship. The shorter relative is found in poetry long before the time of Solomon (Judges 5:7) and is here a conscious mark of poetry, as is seen from the use of אֲשֶׁר in the prose of 1:1. The extensive commerce of Solomon accounts for the introduction of a few Persian, Greek or Indian words, the names of articles imported from those countries or of gardens imitated from them. The Aramaic words may have been introduced in imitation of the northern dialect which was spoken by Shulamite.

III. **Interpretation.** Three methods of interpretation of this admittedly difficult book have prevailed; the allegorical, the literal and the typical.

1. The *Allegorical* Interpretation was favored by the

Jews from the earliest times, was introduced into the Christian Church by Origen, and has been favored in modern times in a moderate form by Lowth, Hengstenberg, Keil, and Stuart. This view generally denies the historical character of the events recorded. In its Jewish form, it considers the book a poem descriptive of the love between Jehovah and Israel, and in the Christian form between Christ and the church or the believer. Every detail is explained on this theory, often in a fanciful way.

The principal arguments in favor of this method are:

A. It is thought necessary to justify the presence of the book in the canon. The book seems to be a song of merely earthly if not sensual love. It is argued that it must have had a religious meaning or it would not have been received into the canon.

B. The same imagery is found throughout the Bible. Repeatedly in the Old Testament the relation of Jehovah to His people is compared to marriage (Is. 54:5; 61:10) and apostasy from Him is compared to whoredom (Ex. 34:15-16; Lev. 20:5-6; Jer. 3:1; Ezek. chapters 16 and 23 and Hosea 1-3). In the New Testament the same figure is transferred to the relation between Christ and the church (Eph. 5:23-32).

C. The same allegorical method is applied to Psalm 45 and Isa. 5:1-7.

Answer.—These arguments apply with equal force in favor of the typical interpretation. On the other hand serious objections may be raised to the allegorical method.

A. There is nothing in the book itself which precludes its historical character. Historical characters and

places are mentioned and the whole book bears the marks of reality.

B. The allegorical method requires the explanation of every detail in a spiritual way and therefore leads to the most extravagant and unfounded interpretations, which bring the book into disrepute with reasonable people. Thus the Targum makes the entire song an allegorical interpretation of the history of Israel from the Exodus to the coming of the Messiah.

2. The *Literal* Interpretation at the other extreme considers the Song as literal history without any ulterior meaning. In order to justify its presence in the canon in modern times the *Shepherd-hypothesis* has been advocated by Jacobi, Umbreit, Ewald, and most moderns. These writers find a third character in the song, a poor Galilean shepherd to whom Shulamite was espoused. They claim that the book represents the faithfulness of Shulamite to her shepherd lover in spite of the allurements of Solomon, who met her during a journey through Galilee and brought her to his harem near Jerusalem. Solomon is said to urge her to become his wife while she steadfastly refuses and finally, leaving the palace, returns to her shepherd lover.

The arguments for the Shepherd-hypothesis are chiefly three:—

A. Shulamite speaks of her lover as a shepherd (1:7, 16-17; 6:2-3).

It is however quite natural in a highly poetic and figurative book that this simple country maiden should speak of her royal lover in language borrowed from her northern home.

Answer.—That the language refers figuratively to Solomon and not literally to a Galilean shepherd seems

evident in 6:2-3. It would be very strange to say of a poor shepherd: "My beloved has gone down to his garden, to the beds of spices, to feed in the gardens and to gather lilies. I am my beloved's and my beloved is mine. He feedeth his flock among the lilies." But the passage is plain when it is referred to Solomon's going down into his garden of spices and lilies.

B. Certain passages are said to be inexplicable if there be no rival of Solomon. Thus the words to the daughters of Jerusalem not to "stir up nor awake love till it please" (2:7; 3:5; 8:4) are said to be an adjuration of Shulamite "not to excite in her the passion of love artificially" (for Solomon).

Answer.—The added words "till it please" imply that Shulamite is not unalterably opposed to affection for Solomon. Her love for him is so strong that if permitted its full exercise it would be painful. In each case this adjuration follows the meeting of the lovers. If the lovers be Shulamite and the shepherd, it would be indeed strange for Shulamite immediately to speak of a time when love for Solomon would be pleasing.

Other passages which are said to be unnatural are 3:4; 4:6; 6:4-5, 12; 7:8, 12; 8:1. These passages however are explicable on the theory that the book is a wedding-song containing recollections of the ante-nuptial experiences of Solomon and Shulamite. The events mentioned are not recorded as having occurred in the order stated but depict the emotions of the lovers in times of union and separation.

C. The speeches of the shepherd lover (2:10-14; 4:8-15; 5:1; 8:13) are said to differ in tone from those of Solomon (1:9-11, 15; 2:2; 4:1-7; 6:4-10; 7:

1-9). Thus Driver says: "The speeches attributed to the king are somewhat stiff and formal; those of the lover on the contrary breathe a warm and devoted affection" (Introduction p. 447).

Answer.—This is made so by assigning the warm passages to the shepherd and the more formal ones to Solomon. The arbitrariness of this process is most evident in chapter 4 of which the first seven verses are assigned to Solomon and verses 8-15 to the shepherd, although the whole is evidently from one speaker. The critics are forced to this conclusion because in verses 8-15 the lover calls Shulamite his bride. Furthermore if Solomon's speeches are stiff and formal, his alleged character as the seducer of Shulamite is not supported. The allusions in the so-called speeches of the shepherd to northern places and customs are in reality references of Solomon in remembrance of his journey through Galilee where he first met Shulamite.

There are other very serious *objections to the Shepherd-hypothesis:*

A. It represents Solomon as a monster of iniquity taking an innocent country girl by force for his harem. Although Solomon departed from the ways of David in later life, neither the record of him in the historical books nor the speeches universally assigned to him in this book warrant this representation of his character; and if he had such a character, it is very strange that he should have allowed Shulamite to escape him and marry the shepherd, as the critics affirm.

B. It is necessary to read much into the text of Shulamite's speeches to imagine her resisting the advances of Solomon.

C. If the Shepherd-hypothesis be true, the presence of

the book in the canon is inexplicable. It represents the shame of Solomon. And yet Solomon is either its author or its hero according to the superscription. Elsewhere Solomon is represented as the inspired author of wisdom and the Prince of Peace. That his shame should be thus depicted without a hint either of his repentance or his punishment is incredible.

In view of these arguments the statement of Delitzsch is justified that the shepherd "is nothing else than a shadow cast by the person of Solomon" (Commentary p. 8).

3. The *Typical* Interpretation. This view takes the middle ground between the allegorical and the literal, for it neither denies the historical basis of the Song nor its spiritual meaning. It avoids the fancifulness of the allegorical, since the type foreshadows the antitype only in a few main points, and the fancifulness of the Shepherd-hypothesis since it finds the purpose of the book not in the faithfulness of Shulamite under imaginary temptation but in the typical relation between Solomon, the type of Christ, and Shulamite, the type of the church, the bride of Christ.

The reasonableness of the typical interpretation is seen from the following considerations:

A. The book is called "the Song of Songs." It is inconceivable that it would receive such an exalted name, higher than that of any other poetry in the Old Testament, unless it had a religious meaning.

B. Solomon is a type of Christ. This is seen from the promise to David (II Sam. 7:12-17), from the last words of David (II Sam. 23:1-7), from Solomon's work in building the temple, from Psalm 72, and from the statement of our Lord (Matt. 12:42).

C. The relation of husband and wife is elsewhere in the Old testament typical of the relation between Jehovah and Israel and in the New Testament between Christ and the Church.

The fullest history of the interpretation of the Song is found in Ginsburg's commentary.

IV. **Unity.** A few critics following Herder, de Wette, and Bleek have considered the book a collection of love songs by different authors. But the recurrence of identical or similar expressions (2:7; 3:5; 8:4; also 2:17; 8:14 and 2:16; 6:3) the presence of Solomon, Shulamite and the daughters of Jerusalem throughout, and the similarity of style mark it as the work of one author. Moreover the artistic progress in the Song makes this conclusion inevitable.

V. **Divisions.** The arrangement of Delitzsch is as follows:

"The whole falls in the following six acts:

"(1) The mutual affection of the lovers, 1:2-2:7; with the conclusion, 'I adjure you, ye daughters of Jerusalem.'

"(2) The mutual seeking and finding of the lovers, 2:8-3:5 with the conclusion, 'I adjure you, ye daughters of Jerusalem,'

"(3) The fetching of the bride and the marriage, 3:6-5:1; beginning with 'Who is this——?' and ending with, 'Drink and be drunken, beloved.'

"(4) Love scorned but won again 5:2-6:8.

"(5) Shulamith the attractively fair but humble princess, 6:10-8:4, beginning with, 'Who is this——?' and ending with 'I adjure you, ye daughters of Jerusalem.'

"(6) The ratification of the covenant in Shulamith's

home, 8:5-14, beginning with, 'Who is this——?'" (Commentary pp. 9-10.)

VI. **Form.** There is action in the Song but it is not a drama, for theatrical performance is foreign to the Semitic genius. The book has no plot. It is a song intended to be sung at the marriage of Solomon and Shulamite, describing events in their courtship. It is comparable with Psalm 45.

II

RUTH

I. **Name.** The book is named from its principal character, רוּת. The origin of the name is uncertain. Some connect it with רָאָה hence "sightly," while others consider it an error for רֵעוּת "friendship." The Greek form is *Ῥούθ.*

II. **Historicity.** The historical character of the events recorded is confirmed by David's friendliness with the king of Moab (I Sam. 22:3-4) which was quite natural since his great-grandmother was Ruth, the Moabitess.

III. **Date.**

1. *Testimony of the Book.* The events occurred two generations before the birth of David in the time of the Judges but were not recorded until after his birth and probably after his accession to the throne (4:21-22). A date in David's reign accounts for the purpose of the book, to give the ancestry of the king. Moreover the necessity of explaining the custom of establishing a bargain by drawing off the shoe (4:7) is accounted for by the fact that such primitive customs would probably be changed at the beginning of the kingdom.

2. *Critical opinion.* Some critics assign the book to the time of the later kings and others to a post-exilic date for the following reasons:

A. The explanation of 4:7 is said to imply a long period of time after the events before they were recorded.

Answer.—The radical change of government from the time of Ruth to that of David would make such an explanation necessary after fifty years.

B. It is affirmed that the writer was acquainted with the Book of Deuteronomy (Ruth 4:7 compare Deut. 25:7, 9) and the Deuteronomic Book of Judges (Ruth 1:1).

Answer.—Since the books of Deuteronomy and Judges do not belong to the time to which the critics assign them, the acquaintance of the author of Ruth with them does not prove a late date.

C. Certain words are said to indicate a later time. The formula וְאֵלֶּה תּוֹלְדוֹת (4:18) and הוֹלִיד are among the criteria of the so-called Hexateuchal document P. Other late forms are לָהֵן (1:13 compare Dan. 2:6, 9; 4:24); שִׂבֵּר (1:13 compare Isa. 38:18; Ps. 104:27; 119:166; 145:15; Esther 9:1); מַרְגְּלוֹת (3:4, 7, 8, 14, found elsewhere only Dan. 10:6) and קַיִם (4:7 compare Ezek. 13:6; Ps. 119:28, 106; Esther 9:21, 27, 29, 31, 32; Dan. 6:8).

Answer.—Since the so-called document P was really the work of Moses, resemblances to it in the book of Ruth are no evidence of date. Moreover it is practically impossible that the book of Ruth was written after the date to which the critics assign P. The prejudice against foreign alliances in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah was so strong (Ezra 9-10; Neh. 13; 23-29) that a book tracing the ancestry of David to Moab would have been discredited. Driver and Strack consider the genealogy (Ruth 4:18-22), in which the resemblances to P are found, a later addition, in which case the argument falls. In view of the general purity of the style of Ruth, the presence of a few words found elsewhere in late books

is not sufficient evidence of a later origin. The Hebrew literature which we possess is not large enough to make the affirmation safe, that these words were not used in the time of David.

Nowack has adduced the following forms of expression which Ruth has in common with Samuel and Kings:

"Jehovah do so to me and more also" (Ruth 1:17 compare I Sam. 3:17; 14:44; I Kings 2:23).

"All the city was moved about them" (Ruth 1:19 compare I Sam. 4:5; I Kings 1:45).

"Her hap was" (Ruth 2:3; compare I Sam. 6:9; 20:26, etc.); פְּלֹנִי אַלְמֹנִי (Ruth 4:1 compare I Sam. 21:3; II Kings 6:8).

גְּלֹה אֹזֶן (Ruth 4:4 compare I Sam. 9:15; 20:2 etc.). Nowack thinks these are intentional imitations of the older style. But if the literary argument has any value, the presence of these words in the Book of Ruth is evidence that it belongs to an age not later than that of Samuel and Kings and probably to the time of David himself.

IV. **Purpose.** The purpose of the book was to fill up the gap in the ancestry of David (I Sam. 16:1-13) showing the pious stock from which he sprang and his connection with the Gentile tribe of Moab. Thus it is an important link in the ancestry of Jesus Christ. Since His mission was to all the world, it was meet that the pious Gentiles should have a place among his ancestors.

Some like Reuss, who places the book shortly after the fall of Samaria, consider it an attempt to establish for the Davidic dynasty authority over the northern territory through Obed, the legal son of the Ephraimite Mahlon. It is **however an** error to consider Mahlon an

Ephraimite (1:2) and in any case the relation of Obed to Mahlon was not sufficient to warrant such authority. Others like Driver suggest that it may be "a collateral didactic aim of the author to inculcate the duty of marriage on the part of the next-of-kin with a widow left childless" (p. 454). Others still, like Kuenen and Cornill, consider it a polemic against the narrow opposition of Ezra to intermarriage with foreigners. Such an extreme view is sufficiently answered by an unprejudiced reading of the book itself.

V. **Divisions.**

1. History of Ruth till her arrival at Bethlehem. Chapter 1.

2. Boaz shows her favor during the harvest. Chapter 2.

3. Ruth requests Boaz to act as kinsman. Chapter 3.

4. Boaz fulfils his promise. Their descendants. Chapter 4.

III

LAMENTATIONS

I. **Name.** In the Hebrew Bible the book is named אֵיכָה from its first word. Many printed texts, however, follow the Talmudic and Rabbinic name קִינוֹת which describes the nature of its contents. The Septuagint renders this name θρῆνοι Ἱερεμίου, which in the Vulgate is transliterated Threni and by the Fathers was translated Lamentationes Jeremiæ. The English name is derived from the Latin.

II. **Structure.** The book contains five distinct elegies corresponding to the five chapters. In the first four the arrangement is alphabetical. Thus in chapters 1 and 2 one verse is given to each letter of the Hebrew alphabet in regular order and the verses consist of three parts each. In chapter 3 three verses are given to each letter but the verses consist of but one member; and in chapter 4 one verse is given to each letter, the verses consisting of two members. The alphabetic arrangement of chapters 2-4 is broken in each case by the transposition of the letters ע and פ. No satisfactory explanation of this has been offered. Chapter 5 drops the alphabetic arrangement although it has twenty-two verses.

III. **Author.**

1. *Traditional Opinion.* Until modern times Jeremiah was universally conceded to be the author of the book. The book itself does not contain his name. The Sep-

tuagint prefixes this sentence: "And it came to pass after Israel was led into captivity, and Jerusalem laid waste, that Jeremiah sat weeping, and lamented with this lamentation over Jerusalem and said:" These words are thought by some to have been in the Hebrew original from which the Septuagint was made. Though such a conclusion is not warranted, the statement presents a very early tradition. The same preface is found in the Vulgate, with the addition, "and in bitterness of heart sighing and crying said:" The Targum and Peshitta likewise assign the book to Jeremiah.

Much confusion has been caused by referring II Chron. 35:25 to this book. There we read: "And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah: and all the singing men and the singing women spake of Josiah in their lamentations to this day: and behold they are written in the lamentations" (עַל־הַקִּינוֹת). It is insisted by certain radical critics that this refers to the canonical book of Lamentations and that the Chronicler erroneously thought from 2:7 and 4:20 that this book was the dirge of Jeremiah over Josiah.

Answer.—A careful reading of the book shows that it is not at all appropriate as a dirge for Josiah. It is hardly conceivable that the Chronicler could have been so ignorant of the contents of this canonical book. The book of Lamentations to which he referred was totally distinct from the one before us. Apparently it contained the lamentations of the singing men and women as well as those of Jeremiah and may have been an extensive collection of dirges for use at funerals. Josephus probably refers to this extra-canonical book when he says (Antiq. 10:5): "Jeremiah composed a dirge for Josiah's funeral which remains unto this day."

It is incredible that Josephus was so ignorant of the contents of the canonical book that he thought it a dirge for Josiah's funeral. But even though the passages in Chronicles and in Josephus do not refer to our book, they confirm the tradition that Jeremiah composed dirges. And if Jeremiah was preëminent in this form of poetry, what is more probable than that he wrote this book? Even Cornill admits that the authorship of Jeremiah possesses a certain probability.

An examination of the book itself and a comparison of it with the prophecy of Jeremiah strongly confirms the traditional view. In form of expression as well as in general argument it has many points in common with the prophecy.

Driver mentions the following similarities (p. 462):

Lam. 1:2	compare	Jer. 30:14	
" 1:8*b*-9	"	"	13:22*b*. 26
" 1:16*a*	"	"	9:1, 18*b*
" 2:11*a*	"	"	13:17*b*
" 3:48-49	"	"	14:17
" 2:11	"	"	6:14
" 3:48	"	"	8:11, 21
" 4:10	"		
" 2:14	"	"	2:8
" 4:13	"	"	5:31
	"	"	14:13*f*
	"	"	23:11
" 2:20	"	"	19:9
" 4:10			
" 2:22	"	"	6:25
	"	"	20:10
" 3:14	"	"	20:7

Lam.	3:15.....	compare...	Jer. 9:15
			" 23:15
"	3:47.....	"	" 48:43
"	3:52.....	"	" 16:16*b*
"	4:21*b*.....	" ...	" 25:15
			" 49:12
"	5:16.....	"	" 13:18*b*

2. *Critical Opinion.* The majority of modern critics, while they acknowledge the force of these arguments, deny that Jeremiah wrote this book. They think it was the product of his time or soon after and some suggest that its author may have been a follower of Jeremiah, so familiar is he with the book of that prophet. The arguments of these critics are as follows:

A. The position of the book among the Kethubhim militates against Jeremiah's authorship.

Answer.—It has been shown in the chapter on the canon that Lamentations was not always reckoned among the Kethubhim but was placed there as one of the five Megilloth which are arranged in our Hebrew Bibles in the order of their liturgical use, Lamentations being read in the synagogue on the ninth of Ab in commemoration of the destruction of the temple.

B. Several passages are said to be very strange if written by Jeremiah.

"Her prophets also find no vision from the Lord" (2:9).

Answer.—This passage is not as strong a condemnation of false prophets as Jeremiah gave in his prophecy (14:14; 23:16).

"In our watching, we have watched for a nation that could not save us" (4:17). The author is said to class

himself here with the party in Israel who sought help from Egypt while Jeremiah always opposed such a course.

Answer.—The author does not however identify himself with this party but with the nation in which the party was predominant just as a member of the minority in congress might say: "We did so and so" although he voted against the action.

The reference to Zedekiah as, "the breath of our nostrils" and "the anointed of the Lord" (Lam. 4: 20) is said to be inconsistent with Jeremiah's prophecy concerning him in Jer. 24: 8-10.

Answer.—Such terms are quite usual in reference to the rightful king of the Davidic line. David repeatedly spoke of Saul as "the Lord's anointed" even after Saul's rejection and while he was persecuting him (I Sam. 24: 6, 10; 26: 9, 11, 16, 23; II Sam. 1: 14, 16). It seems to have been a common title of the king (II Sam. 19: 21). Although Zedekiah was appointed king by Nebuchadnezzar (II Kings 24: 17; Jer. 37: 1), he belonged to the royal line as a son of Josiah (Jer. 37: 1). Jeremiah doubtless had set his hopes upon Zedekiah when he first became king. He therefore calls him "the breath of our nostrils." This hope was disappointed.

C. The vocabulary of the author of Lamentations contains several words not found in Jeremiah, some of them expressing ideas for which Jeremiah uses other words. Such are עֹנִי (Lam. 1: 3, 7, 9; 3: 1, 19); שׁוֹמֵם (1: 4, 13, 16; 3: 11); יָגָה (1: 4, 5, 12; 3: 32-33) הָבִיט (1: 11-12; 3: 63; 4: 16; 5: 1); אֵדֶנִי (alone 1: 14, 15; 2: 1, 2, 5, 7, 18, 19, 20b; 3: 31, 36, 37, 38); עוֹלֵל (1: 22;

2:30; 3:51); בִּלַּע (2:2, 5, 8, 16); זָנַח (2:7; 3:17, 31); שֶׁ (shorter relative 2:15, 16; 4:9; 5:18); שִׁוַּע (3:8).

Answer.—The poetic nature of Lamentations is the chief cause of these variations from the prophecy. The points of agreement are so many that the diction favors the traditional view of authorship more than the modern critical view.

D. Cornill lays great stress upon certain allusions in Lamentations to Ezekiel.

Lam. 2:1	compare	Ezek. 43:7	
" 2:4	"	"	24:16, 21, 25
" 2:14	"	"	13
		"	22:28
" 2:15	"	"	27:3
" 4:6	"	"	16:46*f*
" 4:20	"	"	19:4, 8

Answer.—An examination of these parallels does not warrant the conclusion of the critics. Jeremiah may have used the expressions independently of Ezekiel. If however the argument be pressed it does not disprove that Jeremiah wrote the Lamentations. For Jeremiah was a contemporary of Ezekiel and the colony of exiles on the river Chebar probably were in communication with those who remained in Judah after the fall of Jerusalem. If so Jeremiah may have been acquainted with the prophecies of Ezekiel.

IV. **Unity.** Several modern critics attack the integrity of the book, although they disagree radically concerning the proper division. Some assign chapter 3 to a different author, others chapters 1 and 3, and others still chapters 1, 3 and 5. They contend that one author

would not have written several poems on the same subject, that certain chapters (2 and 4) are superior to the others, and that the different alphabetic arrangement indicates difference of authorship.

Answer.—It was precisely in accord with Hebrew usage to emphasize a subject by repetition. Certain passages in the writings of any author are superior to others. The differences in the alphabetic arrangement may indicate a lack of fixedness in the order of the letters ע and פ in Jeremiah's time. The use of the same phrases and words throughout the book is proof of unity of authorship.

V. **Divisions.**

1. Zion forsaken and sorrowing. Chapter 1.
2. The desolation described with exhortation and prayer. Chapter 2.
3. The prophet suffers with Zion and yet hopes. Chapter 3.
4. The sufferings of the siege. Chapter 4.
5. Prayer for mercy. Chapter 5.

IV

ECCLESIASTES

I. **Name.** In Hebrew the book is named from the title of the speaker קֹהֶלֶת (1:2, 12; 12:8) a word whose exact meaning is somewhat uncertain. It is Kal active participle feminine of the verb קָהַל which is not found elsewhere in Kal but in Hiphil means to gather an assembly. If the Kal be used with the same meaning as the Hiphil, קֹהֶלֶת means "one who gathers an assembly for the purpose of addressing them." The feminine form is more difficult to explain. It has been thought that wisdom (חָכְמָה) is impersonated in Solomon the preacher. But the noun always takes a masculine verb and if קֹהֶלֶת be feminine in reference to חָכְמָה it is strange that חָכְמָה is not mentioned as the speaker. The more probable explanation is that the feminine is that of office like the Arabic Caliphate, and the German Majestät—hence one who holds the office of preacher.

The Septuagint rendered the word by Ἐκκλησιαστής, which in classic Greek means a member of the ἐκκλησία, or assembly of citizens—hence one who preaches in the ἐκκλησία, the Septuagint rendering of קָהָל the congregation of Israel. The Vulgate transliterates the Greek name into Ecclesiastes. The English versions name the book "Ecclesiastes or the Preacher."

II. **Purpose.** Ecclesiastes is one of the Wisdom

books. From the frequent repetition of the words, "All is vanity" and the generally hopeless nature of its contents, some, both in ancient and modern times, have considered it a pessimistic, sceptical if not atheistic book and have objected to its presence in the canon. Others have thought that it favors materialism and licentiousness.

These objections are the result of a misunderstanding of the book. Not only does the name of God occur many times in it but His creation and rulership of the world are taken for granted (2:24, 26; 3:11, 14, 17, etc.). The fear of God, which is the Old Testament conception of religion, is made the prime duty of man (5:7; 12:13) a duty which does not go unrewarded (7:18; 8:12). The expectation of a divine judgment is found in the book (11:9; 12:14). The attitude of the author toward the future is not that of the sceptic but of one to whom almost nothing concerning the future life was revealed. All his arguments are based upon his observation of this world. He speaks only of that which is done "under the sun" and "under the heavens," for that is all he knows. To judge the book according to the standard of New Testament revelation is absurd and unjust. Yet the author extols the things which are morally good in this world such as going to the house of God (4:17), paying vows to Him (5:4-5), having a good reputation (7:1) and exercising patience (7:8-9). Licentiousness is condemned (7:26).

The author was facing a problem which he had not light enough to solve. He saw much injustice in the world. Apparently the wicked often went unpunished and the righteous died unrewarded. Yet in the face of this mystery the author does not charge God with

injustice. He simply says that God's ways are inscrutable (8:17; 11:5). He trusts that eventually in some way these wrongs shall be righted. This train of thought is specially prominent in 3:17-18 and 5:8. If he exhorts his hearers not to be righteous overmuch (7:16), he uses the term righteous in the sense of performing all the external requirements of religion, for immediately he speaks of the deliverance of him that feareth God (7:18). The plain exhortation to religion (12:1) and the summary of man's duty "to fear God and keep His commandments" (12:13-14) show that the book is not below the Old Testament standard of piety nor the Old Testament doctrine of a future life. Indeed by revealing the injustice of this world and by creating a dissatisfaction with it, the book presented to the Old Testament saints a strong argument for a future life and a strong motive to fear God. To the Christian it is still valuable since it shows that even worldly wisdom recognizes the advantage of a moral life, and of obedience to God as the result of experience, and by its very imperfection it shows the necessity of the New Testament revelation.

III. **Author.**

1. *Solomonic Authorship.* The name of the author is not mentioned in the book. Yet there can be no doubt that by "the son of David, king in Jerusalem" (1:1, 12) none other than Solomon is meant. That no other royal descendant of David can be intended is apparent from the references to Solomon's incomparable wisdom (1:16) and the great works which he made (2:4-11). It is strange that these allusions to Solomon end with the second Chapter. Yet the character of the entire book which resembles the work of the

wise king in the book of Proverbs is in agreement with those references.

According to these indications Ecclesiastes was assigned to Solomon by the uniform consent of all Jewish and Christian scholars until the Reformation period. It was considered the work of his old age. A Hebrew legend, which was probably formed to account for this book, is preserved in the Targum. It affirms that in his old age God drove Solomon from his throne because of his foreign alliances, and that an angel whose face resembled Solomon's was placed upon his throne. The aged king wandered up and down in Palestine lamenting his folly and crying out: "I am Koheleth, whose name was formerly called Solomon, who was king over Israel in Jerusalem." This legend was thought to account for the absence of Solomon's name and his saying "I was king in Jerusalem" (1:12), as though he had then ceased to be king, while Solomon retained the throne till his death. There are still a few who believe in the Solomonic authorship, though the overwhelming weight of authority, both conservative and radical, is against it.

2. *Solomon Impersonated.* Luther seems to have been the first to deny that Solomon wrote this book. He was followed by Hugo Grotius and in the past century hardly a writer of eminence has attempted to defend the older opinion. Even such conservative theologians as Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, and C. H. H. Wright have denied that Solomon was the author. The writer impersonated Solomon or as Bradley expressed it he "chose the title of the king around whose memory clustered innumerable associations as the great sage and philosopher of the Hebrew race; one whose name had become the very type of human wisdom, combined with

human sadness and frailty" (Ecclesiastes p. 21). Such a literary device does not imply deception. The writer depicts Solomon's views concerning life, from the vantage ground of his completed reign. That Solomon is not represented as the actual author but only as the pseudonym which the author takes is evident.

A. The name, Solomon, does not occur in the book, as would almost certainly be the case if he were the author. The title Koheleth is a very unnatural one in the mouth of the king.

B. The past tense: "I was king over Israel in Jerusalem" (1:12) points in the same direction. It is true that this verb might mean: "I have been (and still am) king," but it would be much more natural to omit the verb entirely if the present tense were intended. Since Solomon remained king till his death, this statement could hardly have been written by him but is quite natural in the mouth of the one who impersonates the king.

C. The expression "all who were before me in Jerusalem" (1:16; 2:7), implies a later writer than Solomon. The reference is to kings rather than princes or wise men, and since only David reigned in Jerusalem before him it would be a very strange expression for Solomon. The suggestion that he refers to Melchizedek and Adonizedek is very fanciful. But if these are words of a writer long after Solomon's time they admit of an easy explanation.

3. *Evidences of Date Later than Solomon.*

A. The whole atmosphere of the book is totally different from that of Solomon's time. The time of Solomon was one of widespread prosperity in Palestine (I Kings 4:25). The book of Ecclesiastes on the other

hand presupposes a time of misfortune, tyranny, and oppression (4:1-3; 5:8; 7:10; 8:9; 10:6-7). If King Solomon had known of such injustice in his kingdom as this author reveals, he would certainly have rectified it. And if the oppression is simply that which resulted from the heavy taxation to carry out Solomon's great works (I Kings 12:11, 14) it is inconceivable that Solomon would speak of the oppression in the manner of Koheleth. Indeed the way the author speaks of kings and especially of "the king" shows that he was not a king himself but a subject and that too of a tyrannical king (4:13; 8:2; 9:14-16; 10:16-17, 20).

B. Equally overwhelming is the evidence from the language. Delitzsch has collected a list of 96 forms, words, and expressions in Ecclesiastes which are either found only in that book outside of the Targums and Mishna or are found elsewhere only in such late books as Ezekiel, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, and Malachi (Commentary pp. 190-196). While a small number of such words is not inconsistent with an early date, their number in Ecclesiastes is so large that the conclusion of late date is irresistible.

While all critics who deny the Solomonic authorship consider the book post-exilic there is considerable divergence in the matter of date. Delitzsch, Wright, Cheyne in his "Job and Solomon" and others adhere to the late Persian period (approaching 332 B. C.) while Driver, Plumptre, Cornill and others prefer a date about 200 B.C. The chief point of dispute is whether there are Græcisms in the book or traces of the influence of the Greek philosophy. Certain writers find traces of Stoicism in the doctrine of cycles (3:1-8) and in the fatalism of the book, and of Epicureanism in its com-

parison of men to beasts and consideration of pleasure as the highest good. All these phenomena may be accounted for as of Hebrew origin. Even Renan denied that the book contains traces of Greek philosophy although he assigned it to 125 B.C. The theory of Graetz that Ecclesiastes was composed by Herod the Great in B.C. 4 is disproved by the allusions to it in Ecclesiasticus (B.C. 170) and by the presence of Ecclesiastes in the Septuagint.

All the facts of the book are adequately explained by assigning it as Hengstenberg does to the time of Malachi (about 433 B.C.). The books of Ezra and Nehemiah give evidence of the very political corruption and oppression which are reflected in Ecclesiastes (Ezra 4:5; 9:7; Neh. 1:3; 5:4, 5, 18; 9:36-37). The capriciousness of the monarch in the book of Esther is of the same sort. Hengstenberg also points out that "we encounter here, as in Malachi that moroseness which ever accompanies unspiritual religion and soulless morality" (Commentary p. 6). Formalism was characteristic of the religion after the Exile. There is then nothing in the political conditions presupposed by this book or its language which requires a date later than 400 B.C. And if this date be correct it is among the latest books of the Old Testament.

IV. **Integrity.** The general integrity of the book is universally acknowledged. Certain critics however consider a few verses to have been later additions. The epilogue (12:9-14) is suspected by many. The first part (9-12) of it is rejected because without it the book begins and ends with the same statement and because it speaks of Koheleth as a wise man while elsewhere he is represented as a king. There is no reason however why

the book should be forced to end with the same statement with which it begins. Solomon was the founder of the school of wise men as well as king. Krochmal considers the epilogue (12:9-14) to have been added as a concluding statement for the entire Kethubhim and that verse 12 refers to the admission of this and the other Antilegomena into the canon. This fanciful theory has not met with acceptance. It is sufficiently refuted by the fact that Ecclesiastes never, so far as we know, stood at the end of the Old Testament canon.

The objection to the remainder of the epilogue (12:13-14) as well as to several other brief passages (3:17; 7:5; 8:12-13; 11:9b; 12:1a, 7b) is that they display a higher religious tone than that which pervades the remainder of the book. Many affirm that these passages were inserted with the purpose of saving the orthodoxy of the book and that then it was admitted to the canon. It is noteworthy, on the other hand, that so radical a critic as Cornill opposes the removal of these passages and asserts that the same thoughts run throughout the book. The objections to these passages proceed from the false assumption that the book is sceptical. If rightly understood, they do not contradict other statements of the author and their removal destroys the completeness of the argument.

V. **Divisions.**

The vain things.	*The good things.*
Labor 1:3-11	
Wisdom 1:12-18	
Pleasure 2:1-11	Wisdom better than folly 2:12-26
Effort 3:1-15	

The vain things.	*The good things.*
Justice 3:16 to 4:3	
Skill 4:4-12	
Power 4:13-16	
Formalism 5:1-7	
Wealth 5:8 to 6:12	A good name 7:1-10
	Wisdom 7:11 to 8:9
	Piety 8:10-15
Fortune 8:16 to 9:6, 11-16	Joy 9:7-10
Aristocracy 9:17 to 10:11	
Folly 10:12-15	
A young King 10:16-20	Enterprise 11:1-8
	Youth 11:9-10
	Piety in youth 12:1-14

V

ESTHER

I. **Name.** The book is named from its principal character. In the Talmud it is called מְגִלַּת אֶסְתֵּר or more simply אֶסְתֵּר. The Hebrew name of Esther was הֲדַסָּה (2 : 7) which means "myrtle." This was changed to the Persian name אֶסְתֵּר which means "star," when she became the queen of Ahasuerus. In the Septuagint the name is Ἐσθήρ, and in the Vulgate, as in the English, Esther.

II. **Historicity.** Many critics deny the credibility of this book, while many others think that although it has a historical basis, the author has been guilty of exaggeration and enlargement upon the facts. The arguments against the reliability of the story are as follows:

1. There are said to be several improbabilities in the book.

A. History knows nothing of any queen of Xerxes between the 7th and 12th years of his reign besides Amestris, whose cruelty and superstition as represented by Herodotus preclude her identification with Esther. Nor could Esther have been one of the women of the royal harem, for she is mentioned as queen (2 : 16-17).

Answer.—The representations concerning Esther agree remarkably with the history of the reign of Xerxes. Vashti was divorced in the third year of his reign (1 : 3) and Esther did not become queen until the

seventh year (2:16). This interval agrees precisely with the statements of Herodotus that Xerxes began his Greek campaign in the third year and in the seventh year sought relief from his defeat in the harem. Since the book of Esther does not inform us concerning the date of Esther's death although she lived till the twelfth year of the king's reign (3:7) while the king reigned twenty years in all, there remain eight years during which Amestris may have been queen without interfering with the story of Esther. In our ignorance concerning the facts there is no necessity of casting discredit upon the Bible record.

B. The issuing of the decree for the destruction of the Jews eleven months in advance, the ignorance of the king that Esther was a Jewess, his ignorance concerning his own decree (7:5-6), his allowing the Jews to defend themselves, their success against overwhelming odds and the height of the gallows (fifty cubits 5:14) are said to be very improbable.

Answer.—Truth is often stranger than fiction. Mere improbability is not sufficient reason to discredit a story. The ignorance of the king concerning Esther's nationality may have been due to her lack of the usual Jewish features or to his drunkenness at the time when he saw her. The latter point is sufficient explanation of his ignorance concerning the decree (7:7). The capriciousness of the king and his affection for Esther make the second decree not unnatural. Our inability to account for the other statements is certainly no proof that they are false. There is nothing incredible in the statement that the gallows was 75 feet high. History records many instances of a small but determined band defending themselves successfully against great odds.

2. The dramatic elements in the book are said to mark it as a romance rather than history. These are particularly the contrast of Haman and Mordecai, the two decrees, the hanging of Haman on the gallows he prepared for his enemy, and the climax of the story in the victory of the Jews. These and similar points have given weight to the theory that the book is a story written to show the prowess of the Jews.

Answer.—Precisely such coincidences sometimes occur and the very fact that they are unusual suggests their being recorded. The most that this argument can prove is that the author seized upon the dramatic features in these remarkable experiences of the Jews for the purpose stated.

On the other hand there are powerful *arguments in favor of the truthfulness of the narrative.*

(1) The feast of Purim, whose origin is described in the book is still observed. In II Macc. 15:36 this feast is called "the day of Mordecai." No other satisfactory explanation of this feast has been presented.

(2) Ahasuerus is represented as just such a passionate, capricious, and profligate monarch as Xerxes.

(3) The book is free from the historical inaccuracies such as are found in the Apocryphal books of Tobit and Judith. It presents the life at the Persian court as it is known from secular history.

(4) The story is presented as literal history since it refers to the Chronicles of the kings of Persia (2:23; 6:1; 10:2).

III. **Purpose.** Many in ancient and modern times have objected to the presence of this book in the canon for two principal reasons:

1. Not only has the book no religious purpose but the name of God does not occur in it.

Answer.—The reason for the absence of the divine name from the book is unknown. It seems to have been purposely omitted, though the author points out the remarkable way in which Jehovah saved the Jews from destruction. Providence is alluded to in 4:14 while fasting is mentioned in 4:16 and 9:31 and prayer in 9:31. It should be remembered that the history of Israel was considered religious especially at such a crisis as this. The fact that the feast of Purim to this day commemorates that deliverance shows the religious character of the book.

2. It is objected that the book, contrary to the spirit of scripture, exalts cruelty and vengeance. Esther's request that the bodies of Haman's sons be exposed upon the gallows (9:13) and especially the acquiescence of Esther and Mordecai in the king's cruel decree to allow the slaughter of innocent women and children (8:8, 11) and the massacre of 75,000 persons are said to be contrary to the spirit of the gospel.

Answer.—It is not necessary to defend Esther, Mordecai, or the Jews. Their acts are in accord with the spirit of the times and of the Oriental court. Any more humane conduct would probably have resulted in the annihilation of the Jews. In no case is the inspiration of the book endangered.

The purpose of the book of Esther is to show God's protection of His people in a strange land, thus at the same time recording the origin of one of their principal feasts.

IV. Date and Authorship. Xerxes who is universally conceded to have been the Ahasuerus of this

book reigned 485-465 B.C. The book speaks of this monarch as though his reign was not very recent (1:1). Yet the author displays a noteworthy acquaintance with Persian customs and history. The diction of the book is admittedly late and is comparable with that of Ecclesiastes, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles.

From these facts, those who admit the historicity of the book place it during the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus (464-425 B.C.). This date accounts for all its literary phenomena. Many critics however who deny its historicity, place it in the Greek period (third century B.C.) or in the time of the Maccabees (167-130 B.C.). Their only arguments are found in the alleged late dates of other books, with which its diction marks it as contemporaneous.

The majority of critics agree that the author was a Persian Jew, on account of the absence of marks of its being written in Palestine. The suggestion from Mordecai's writing (9:20-32) that he was the author does not agree with the internal evidence (9:3-4).

V. Divisions.

1. Esther made queen instead of Vashti, 1:1 to 2:18.

2. Intrigues of Haman against Mordecai and the Jews 2:19 to 7:10.

3. The Jews' deliverance and the memorial feast. **Chapters 8-10.**

SECTION III: HISTORICAL BOOKS

I

DANIEL

I. **Name.** The book is named from its author and principal character, דָּנִיֵּאל. This name was borne also by the second son of David (I Chron. 3:1) and by a priest who returned with Ezra to Judæa (Ezra 8:2; Neh. 10:6). Its meaning is "God is my judge." In the Septuagint the form is Δανιήλ and in the Vulgate Daniel.

II. **Authorship and Date.**

It is considered one of the most certain results of modern criticism that the Book of Daniel was composed during the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes (168-165 B.C.). This result is reached by a two-fold argument—critical and exegetical. The critical argument attempts to prove that the book could not have arisen during the Exile nor at least before the beginning of the Greek period (about 300 B.C.) while the exegetical argument makes the predictions of the book refer at great length to the period of Antiochus Epiphanes and thus determines upon that time for its production.

We believe that all these arguments can be successfully met and that other considerations make the traditional view far more tenable—viz. that the book was composed in the time of Daniel and by him.

The *arguments for a date much later than Daniel* are as follows:

1. *Historical.*

A. The position of the Book of Daniel among the Kethubhim and even toward the end of that last division of the Hebrew canon is said to prove that it could have been in existence when the canon of the Prophets was closed and hence not until long after the Exile. Daniel is considered a prophet by the critics, and his book is said to be similar to that of Jonah which found a place in the canon of the Prophets.

Answer.—It has been shown in the chapter on the Canon that the three-fold division does not indicate three successive stages of collection but the position of a book was determined by the official status of its author. There is no evidence that the third division of the canon was kept open any later than the second. Daniel was not officially a prophet though he had the prophetic gift. Even this was of a kind which, the critics are loudest in affirming, was merely incidental to prophecy—viz. his power of prediction. The resemblances to Jonah are entirely superficial. Jonah was a prophet in Israel before he was sent to Nineveh (II Kings 14:25). He went to that city with a message of repentance. He never joined himself to the Assyrian Court but in Jewish exclusiveness stayed outside of the city hoping to see it destroyed. Daniel on the other hand does not introduce his book with his own name as though his official status was important. He is represented merely as one of the Jewish exiles who was joined to the court of Babylon and attained great honor there by his probity and his power to interpret dreams. He lived nearly all his life apart

from his own nation. Even in relation to Babylon he was no prophet, no religious reformer.

B. Jesus, the son of Sirach, who wrote the Book of Ecclesiasticus (about 170 B.C.) mentions Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and collectively the Twelve Minor Prophets but says nothing of Daniel. Hence it is inferred that the Book of Daniel was not extant in his time. The statement of Ecclus. 49:15 ("Neither was there a man born like unto Joseph") is thought to have been impossible to one who knew of Daniel who certainly was "like unto Joseph."

Answer.—This argument is very weak, for the allusion to the twelve prophets after Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel (Ecclus. 49:8-10) shows that the author is following the order of the Hebrew books. He does not mention Daniel because his book was not classed with the Prophets. The omission of Daniel in the list of worthies after the Exile is not so remarkable as that of Ezra. Zerubbabel, Joshua, the high-priest, and Nehemiah, are mentioned but not Ezra. Yet no one on this account would deny the existence of Ezra or his book. The statement concerning Joseph is explained by the author himself: "Neither was there a man born like unto Joseph, a governor of his brethren, a stay of the people, whose bones were regarded of the Lord." Although Daniel was "like unto Joseph" in his exalted position at a heathen court, he was not like him in these three respects.

C. The statement of Dan. 1:1 that Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, came unto Jerusalem and besieged it, "in the third year of Jehoiakim king of Judah" is said to be an error and therefore unlikely from a contemporary writer. It is affirmed that this statement

is inconsistent with Jeremiah who makes the fourth year of Jehoiakim the same as the first year of Nebuchadnezzar (25:1) and then speaks of the coming of Nebuchadnezzar as still future (25:8; 36:29).

Answer.—This statement is explained by two simple facts.

First, in Assyria and Babylon a king's reign was usually reckoned from the New Year's day after his accession but in Judah often from the previous New Year's day (Hastings B.D. Vol. I. p. 400). Inscriptions in Babylon are dated in the reign of a king up to the close of the year in which he died. Daniel naturally follows this Babylonian method and thus his "third year of Jehoiakim" is identical with Jeremiah's "fourth year."

Second, the date mentioned by Daniel is that of the starting of Nebuchadnezzar's expedition from Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar met the opposition of Pharaoh-Necho. It was not until after his victory over the Egyptians at Carchemish (Jer. 46:2) that he proceeded against Jerusalem. Dr. Green (General Introduction, The Canon, p. 59) draws attention to the fact that the same verb found in Dan. 1:1 is used in Jonah 1:3 of a ship which was starting out for Tarshish. Thus Nebuchadnezzar started for Jerusalem in the third year of Jehoiakim according to the Babylonian reckoning but arrived in a later year. Meanwhile Jeremiah foretold his coming.

D. The term, "Chaldeans," is used in Daniel (1:4; 2:2, 10; 14:7; 5:7; 11) of the caste of wise men, a meaning which the critics affirm it did not have until after the Babylonian language died out and hence until after Daniel's time.

Answer.—It is hard to prove a negative. Our knowledge of the Babylonian literature of the time of Daniel is not so complete that we can safely affirm that "Chaldean" never meant the caste of wise men in his time. Indeed Schrader says that we are thus far confined to Assyrian sources for our knowledge of the Chaldeans. We are therefore in no position to dispute the true use of the word in the Book of Daniel.

E. Belshazzar is called king and the son of Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. 5:1, 9, 22, 30; 7:1; 8:1) although the inscriptions speak of him only as "the king's son" and as the son of Nabonidus who was a usurper and no relation to Nebuchadnezzar.

Answer.—Formerly the very existence of Belshazzar was denied. The discovery of the Chronicles of Nabonidus with their frequent mention of Belsharuzur as "the king's son" was a great victory for the accuracy of Daniel. In these chronicles it is said that Belshazzar commanded his father's troops in Northern Babylonia in the early part of the reign of Nabonidus while his father remained near Babylon. Then there is a break in the inscription, after which it is said that Nabonidus himself was with the troops in the North. The natural inference is that he left his son in charge in Babylon and that his son was addressed as king. There is a remarkable confirmation of this conjecture in the statement that Belshazzar made Daniel "the third ruler of the kingdom" (Dan. 5:29), for since Belshazzar was himself second to Nabonidus, he could make Daniel only third. The translation "rule as one of three" in this passage does violence to the text.

It is not known how Belshazzar was the son of Nebuchadnezzar. The suggestion that Nabonidus may have

strengthened his position as king by marrying a daughter of the great king Nebuchadnezzar is made the more plausible by the fact that he named one of his sons Nebuchadnezzar. In this case Belshazzar was the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar and according to the Hebrew usage could be called his son.

F. No such character as Darius the Mede is known to history (5:31; 6:1). Cyrus took Babylon directly. Driver suggests that Darius the Mede was probably an error for Darius Hystaspis, who at a later time retook Babylon after a rebellion while Prince further suggests that the author confuses Babylon with Nineveh, which was taken by the Medes.

Answer.—Although several suggestions have been offered concerning the identity of Darius the Mede, his name has not yet been found in the cuneiform inscriptions. The cases of Belshazzar and Sargon (Isa. 20:1), both of whom were formerly unknown to history except from the Bible, are sufficient caution against denying his existence and his ruling in Babylon before Cyrus. The most probable theory identifies Darius the Mede with Gobryas, a Median General of Cyrus, who took the city of Babylon and who was so important that the annalistic inscription of Cyrus says: "Gubaru, his governor, appointed governors in Babylon." What could be more natural than for Cyrus to cement his alliance with the Medes by leaving their general as virtual king in Babylon, while he went on to complete the conquest of the country? If so the statements of Daniel that Darius "received the kingdom" (5:31) and that he "was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans" (9:1) receive a new meaning. The statement of Dan. 6:1 that "it pleased Darius to set over

the kingdom an hundred and twenty princes, which should be over the whole kingdom also agree precisely with that that "Gubaru, his governor, appointed governors in Babylon." The mention of the Medes and Persians together (Dan. 6:8, 12, 15) also confirms the theory. It is certainly not impossible that Gubaru assumed the title of king and the name of Darius.

G. The expression of 9:2 that Daniel "understood by the books" that the seventy years of exile were almost complete, is said to imply that Jeremiah was one of a collection of canonical books, which was not the case in Daniel's time.

Answer.—This expression does not necessitate a canon any more than Isaiah 8:16-20 or 34:16. It simply implies that Daniel had in his possession the sacred books so far as they were in existence and in particular Jeremiah who foretold the seventy years of exile (Jer. 25:11-12; 29:10).

H. The later prophets (Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi) show no trace of the influence of Daniel but on the other hand the Apocalyptic portions of Daniel are said to have been suggested by Ezekiel and Zechariah.

Answer.—It is just as natural to explain the resemblances between Daniel on the one hand and Ezekiel and Zechariah on the other as originating with Daniel as with the other writers. The lack of influence of the Book of Daniel on the later prophets is then partially explained. The comparative silence of those prophets concerning the Book of Daniel is doubtless due to their difference of subject and standpoint.

I. There are said to be several improbable things in Daniel, which indeed are not sufficient to discredit it but which add to the other arguments against it.

Such is the story that Daniel allowed himself to become one of the wise men, that he was accepted as their president (2:13, 48), Nebuchadnezzar's condemnation of all the wise men before hearing them, his lycanthropy and Nebuchadnezzar's and Darius' recognition of the universal sovereignty of Jehovah.

Answer.—Since no great stress is laid upon this argument and since the other arguments which are supposed to give these improbabilities colour have been met, no detailed answer is necessary. Just such improbabilities are constantly occurring and their presence so far from discrediting Daniel is a mark of its genuineness.

2. *Literary.*

A. Driver enumerates fifteen Persian (Daniel in Cambridge Bible p. lvi) words in Daniel such as are found in Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles and asserts that the contract tablets of the time of Nebuchadnezzar show no signs of Persian influence.

Answer.—Several of these words are political and such as would not naturally find their way into the language of the contract tablets. Such are פַּרְתֻּמִים "nobles" (1:3) דָּת "law" (2:9 etc) אֲחַשְׁדַּרְפָּן "satrap" (3:2, 3, etc.) אֲדַרְגָּזַר "counsellor" (3:2, 3) הַדָּבַר "minister" (3:24, 27, etc.) סָגָן "president" (6:2-4, 6-7) and אַפַּדָּן "palace" (11:45). Concerning the others, we have not enough literature of Nebuchadnezzar's time to deny the influence of Persian. Such influence would be felt in the court language, where Daniel was, sooner than among the people. Furthermore Daniel continued into the Persian period.

B. There are three Greek names of musical instruments which it is said could not have reached Babylon

until after the dissemination of Greek influence in Asia by Alexander (332 B.C.). These are *κίθαρις* (3:5, 7, 10, 15) *ψαλτήριον* (3:5, 7, 10, 15) and *συμφωνία* (3:5, 15). Of these *κίθαρις* is a Homeric word and might possibly have found its way to Babylon by Daniel's time but *ψαλτήριον* occurs first in Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) and *συμφωνία* is found first in Plato (429-347 B.C.)

Answer.—In reply we quote the words of Sayce, who nevertheless strongly affirms the Maccabean date for Daniel (Higher Criticism and the Monuments pp. 494-495). "Cuneiform decipherment has made it questionable whether the occurrence of words which may be of Greek orgin is equally certain evidence of a late date—There were Greek colonies on the coast of Palestine in the time of Hezekiah—The Tel-el-Amarna tablets have enabled us to carry back a contact between Greece and Canaan to a still earlier period—It is thus possible that there was intercourse and contact between the Canaanites or Hebrews in Palestine and the Greeks of the Aegean as far back as the age of Moses." Thus it is not at all improbable that through the Assyrian provinces of Asia Minor or from Palestine itself these musical instruments were brought to Babylon. If the Jews were required to furnish music for their captors (Ps. 137:3) why may not captives from the Greek lands of Cyprus, Ionia, Lydia, and Cilicia have brought their musical instruments with them? The absence of two of these words from Greek literature as far back as Daniel's time does not prove that these instruments did not exist in his day.

C. The critics confidently affirm that the Aramaic of Daniel is Western Aramaic identical with that of Ezra

and similar to that of Onkelos and Jonathan. Aramaic inscriptions from Babylon (725-500 B.C.) use the relative זי while Daniel uses די.

Answer.—Other writers affirm with equal confidence that the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra is Eastern Aramaic. It is natural that the Aramaic of the Hebrew exiles should differ somewhat from that current about them. If this argument is pressed, it can only prove that the Aramaic of Daniel was modified at a later date to conform to that in common use, not that the book was originally written in Palestine.

D. The Hebrew of Daniel is said to be crude and late like that of Chronicles (about 300 B.C.).

Answer.—This is exactly what we would expect from a man who spent the greater part of his life at a foreign court. Since however there is no necessity for dating the books of Chronicles later than 400 B.C. the similarity of the Hebrew in Daniel to that of the Chronicles does not require a date later than Daniel himself.

3. *Theological.* The doctrines of angels, the judgment, the resurrection, the kingdom of God, and the Messiah are much more fully developed than in the exilic or early post-exilic literature (Hag. and Zech.). That of angels in particular is said to resemble the post-Biblical literature as seen in the Book of Enoch, which belongs to the first century before Christ.

Answer.—The weight of this argument depends upon the theological tendency of the writer. If it be admitted that Daniel received these doctrines by revelation, the propriety of their being given in his time is immediately seen. The severe afflictions of the Exile made the highly developed doctrines peculiarly appropriate. Nor is the doctrine of angels in Daniel comparable to that of the

post-Biblical books in which Gabriel and Michael are two of the seven archangels (Tobit 12:15). Although no angels are mentioned by name in the Old Testament outside of Daniel, Zechariah makes a distinction of rank among them. The interpreting angel of Zechariah (1:9, 14, 19; 2:3; 4:4-6, 11-14; 5:5-11; 6:4-8) has the same function as Gabriel in Daniel and is probably identical with him (Dan. 8:16-17; 9:21-22). Michael is not called an angel in Daniel but "one of the chief princes" (Dan. 10:13, 21; 12:1). He is probably the same as the angel of the Lord in Zechariah 3:1-3 (Jude 9).

4. *Exegetical.* It is affirmed that the interest of the book culminates in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, which could hardly be the case if the author lived in Babylon four centuries earlier. Accordingly the portions of the book which refer to the period of the Exile are said to rest upon reliable traditions and to have been written during the persecutions of Antiochus in order to encourage the Jews to be faithful to Jehovah by the example of the great things which Jehovah did for his faithful ones under similar circumstances in Babylon. The critics assert that Antiochus is "the little horn" of 7:8, 24-25 as well as 8:9-12, 23-25 and that the clearness of Daniel's predictions terminates with him.

Answer.—The real animus of this argument on the part of the more radical critics is evidently to eliminate the force of clear prediction as a sign of the supernatural. But in this they must surely fail. Even though the events of Daniel's life were calculated to comfort the Jews under the dreadful persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, and even though the Holy Spirit

may have guided Daniel to record them partly for this purpose, they were composed in Babylon and not in Palestine. It is natural that Daniel's predictions in the Exile should give great prominence to the next great affliction of the Jews under a foreign tyrant. Yet the book does not present to us the history of the Exile from the standpoint of the time of Antiochus but the times of Antiochus from the standpoint of the Exile. And prominent as are those times in Daniel's prophetic view, they by no means eclipse what to him was beyond them.

The efforts of the critics to exclude the Roman Empire from the predictions of Daniel 2 and 7 are forced and unnatural. The four empires are the Assyro-Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Greek and the Roman. The second cannot be divided into the Median and the Persian for these are always counted as one in Daniel (5:28; 6:8, 12, 15; 8:20) as well as in Esther (1:3, 14, 18-19) and the Persian did not have four heads as the third beast is said to have had (7:6). Nor can the Greek empire be divided into that of Alexander and that of his successors. Their kingdoms are said to be inferior to his (8:22) while the fourth kingdom is said to be "strong as iron" (2:40) and that it shall devour the whole earth and shall tread it down and break it in pieces (7:23). This was not true of the kingdom of Antiochus but was true of the Roman Empire. Furthermore the two legs of the image correspond remarkably to the Eastern and Western Roman Empires, and the feet and toes, part of iron and part of clay, correspond in general to the ten kingdoms into which the Roman Empire (2:41-43; 7:23-24) was divided, which were a mixture of Latin with other races.

Hence although "the little horn" in 8:9-12, 23-25 evidently refers to Antiochus Epiphanes, "the little horn" of 7:8, 24-26 does not refer to him but to another great opponent of the kingdom of God, proceeding from the fourth or Roman rather than from the third or Greek kingdom. This is Antichrist (II Thess. 2:3-4, 8-10; I John 2:18; Rev. 13:5-7).

The seventy weeks of Dan. 9:24-27 are not a mere reflection of the seventy years of exile nor do they end with Antiochus Epiphanes. They extended from the Exile to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and include the appearance and rejection of Christ (Matt. 24:15-31).

There are also certain *positive arguments for the genuineness of the book* of Daniel.

1. The testimony of our Lord to it (Matt. 24:15) is most distinct: "When therefore ye see the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of through (διά) Daniel the prophet, etc." This reference to Dan. 9:27; 11:31 and 12:11 does not speak of Daniel as a book but as the author of a book. The statement is so explicit that there are only two alternatives to those who deny that Daniel wrote the book—either that Christ spoke ignorantly or that he accommodates himself to the erroneous opinion of his day. How untenable both of these views are has been shown in the chapter on the Pentateuch.

2. The testimony of Ezekiel (14:14, 20; 28:3). In the first two verses Ezekiel mentions Daniel, Noah and Job as three notably righteous men, whose presence in a wicked city would nevertheless not save it from the judgment of God. Prince and others think that Ezekiel must here refer to some other Daniel, a great patriarch

who was worthy to be classed with Noah and Job. It is however inconceivable that such a great and well-known character should have been elsewhere entirely forgotten by the Jews. It certainly is remarkable that Ezekiel should mention a living man, and that a young man, as comparable with Noah and Job, but when we remember that Ezekiel's ministry did not begin until 592 B.C., fourteen years after Daniel's deportation to Babylon, we see that there was abundant opportunity for Daniel's reputation to be established among the exiles. Daniel was possibly 35 years old at the time of Ezekiel's allusion to him. From the high favor he enjoyed at court and his faithfulness to Jehovah he must have been viewed by the exiles as their special advocate and the personification of righteousness.

The other reference fixes Daniel's identity more clearly: "Behold thou art wiser than Daniel; there is no secret that is hid from thee." It is not claimed that these references prove the existence of the Book of Daniel. They prove the existence of the man who is represented as the author of the book. The last reference also confirms the story of his having been one of the wise men of Babylon.

3. The fact that Daniel was received into the canon at all is strong evidence against the view of its origin suggested by the critics. They would have us believe that it was one of the latest books of the Old Testament, although it purports to have been written by a character who lived four centuries earlier and who was so highly respected that he is mentioned with Noah and Job. If it was so late, why was it not among the Antilegomena? The time between the alleged date of its writing (168 B.C.) and its alleged admission into the canon (130 B.C.)

is not long enough to account for its universal acceptance.

4. The faithful representation of history in Babylon is evidence that it was composed there. Prince acknowledges that Dan. 4:30 is a true reflection of Nebuchadnezzar's activity in building. That Darius as a fire-worshipper did not order Daniel thrown into the fire but into a den of lions is another incidental evidence of the truth of the story. Indeed amid all the intricacies of the history no error has ever been proven in the book. This could hardly be the case if it was not written until 168 B.C.

III. **Unity.**

The unity of the book is now generally admitted. A few critics however divide the Aramaic portions (2:4 through chapter 7) from the rest on the ground of the change of language, while others divide chapters 7-12 from 1-6 on account of the change of style and subject.

The book is shown to be one by the following considerations:—

1. It displays an evident plan. The image of chapter 2 corresponds to the beasts of chapter 7. The predictions of chapters 7-12 are represented as the work of Daniel, the principal character of chapters 1-6, and are dated during the reigns of the kings mentioned in chapters 1-6.

2. The change in language does not correspond to the natural divisions of the book. Chapter 1 of the historical portion is in Hebrew and chapter 7 of the prophetic portions in Aramaic. The Aramaic portion begins abruptly in the middle of a story. No entirely satisfactory explanation of this has been offered. The most likely is that Daniel wrote in Hebrew those portions

which were of special interest to the Jews and in Aramaic those portions which relate to the world empires.

IV. **Divisions.**

1. The history of Daniel under the reigns of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Darius, and Cyrus. Chapters 1-6.

2. Prophetic visions which Daniel received during the reigns of Belshazzar, Darius and Cyrus. Chapters 7-12.

II

EZRA-NEHEMIAH

(1) *Ezra*

I. **Name.** The book was named from its author and principal character עֶזְרָא meaning "help." In the Septuagint it is called Ἔσδρας δεύτερον, and in the Vulgate Liber primus Esdræ. The English form of the name follows the Hebrew.

II. **Position.**

The books of Ezra and Nehemiah were often counted as one book in the same manner as the double books (Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles) and the twelve Minor Prophets. In token of this, the Massoretic notes concerning the number of verses in each book are placed after Nehemiah, the whole book is called Ezra, and its middle verse is said to be Neh. 3. 32. In modern Hebrew Bibles however as well as in the Septuagint, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate the two books are separated. Origen speaks of them as First and Second Esdras. Although the two books are closely related, the repetition of the list of those who returned from the Exile (Ezra 2; Neh. 7: 6-70) shows that they cannot have been one book originally. Their being counted so may have been in order to make the total number of books agree with the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet or because Nehemiah continues the history of Ezra.

In the Septuagint the books of Ezra and Nehemiah follow Chronicles. It is possible that this was the original order in the Hebrew Bible since the Massoretic notes on the Kethubhim stand not at the end of Chronicles but of Nehemiah, and since Ezra and Nehemiah carry on the history from the point where Chronicles drops it.

III. **Divisions.**

1. Chaps. 1-6. Account of the return of the first company of exiles under Zerubbabel in 536 B.C. and their rebuilding the temple, based upon original documents.

2. Chaps. 7-10. Account of Ezra's going up to Jerusalem in 458 B.C. and the reforms he instituted.

IV. **Theme.**

The purpose of the book was to give a connected popular history from the priestly standpoint of the reëstablishment of the Jews in their land. This purpose explains the silence of the author concerning the whole period from the completion of the temple (516 B.C.) till his own journey to Jerusalem (458 B.C.). The only glimpse the Bible gives into this period is from the Book of Esther. It was apparently a time of spiritual declension and intermarriage with the surrounding peoples (Ezra 9:1-4). Such a time furnished no material for the historian of the regeneration of Israel. While the books of Haggai and Zechariah shed a side light upon Ezra 1-6, the remaining history in Ezra and Nehemiah has no parallel in the Old Testament. The canonical history appropriately closes with the establishment of Israel in their land, as though awaiting the coming of Christ.

V. **Authorship and Composition.**

The modern critical opinion is that the book of Ezra is a compilation, based partly on memoirs of Ezra

which received its present form probably by the same author as Chronicles, a full century after Ezra. The first two verses of Ezra are the same as the last two of Chronicles. The portions in which the pronoun "I" is used (7:29 through chapter 9) are acknowledged by some critics to be the work of Ezra but those in which he is mentioned in the third person (Chap. 1; 3:1 to 4:5; 4:24 to 5:5; 6:13-22; 7:1-10 and chapter 10) are assigned to the compiler. The remainder of the book consists of older documents.

The *arguments for the critical view* are as follows:

1. Ezra being joined to Chronicles on the one hand and Nehemiah on the other, the evidences of the later production of these books are thought to carry down Ezra to a later time.

Answer.—These evidences will be considered in their proper places. Since Ezra and Nehemiah are independent books, marks of a late date in the latter do not prove the same for the former. And even if, as seems possible, Ezra and Chronicles were by the same author, there is nothing in either book which precludes the theory that that author was Ezra himself.

2. The change from the first to the third person and the mention of Ezra by name is thought to have been impossible if the book was the work of one writer.

Answer.—The same change of person is found in Daniel whose integrity is almost universally admitted. One of the passages where this change of person is used is genealogical (7:1-10) and therefore Ezra's name is required, though written by himself. Possibly the "I" passages are taken from a journal made at the time (7:27-28) while the others were added later by Ezra. If so the impersonal style is quite natural.

3. The remarks about Ezra (7:6, 10) are thought to be strange if made by himself.

Answer.—They are not more laudatory than those of a faithful historian should be. They are needed to explain the story and the latter one exhibits a knowledge of Ezra's thoughts which argues that he wrote it.

4. The silence of the book concerning the sixty years before Ezra's time is taken as evidence that it was not written by him or in his time.

Answer.—This objection is met by a consideration of the purpose of the book already stated.

5. It is said that Ezra would not have placed the section 4:6-23, which refers to events in the reigns of Xerxes (485-465 B.C.) and Artaxerxes (465-425 B.C.) where it now stands, before the record of events which transpired under Darius (521-485 B.C.).

Answer.—Like every other historian, Ezra finishes one subject before going on to the next, even at the expense of direct chronological sequence. In chapter 4 he gives an account of the movements to hinder the re-establishment of Israel as far as the time of Artaxerxes. In chapter 5 he goes back to give the other side of the story, the persistence of the Jews in their work, beginning with the reign of Darius.

6. The mention of Johanan (10:6), probably the same as Jonathan (Neh. 12:10, 22), the grandson of Eliashib, the high-priest in Ezra's day, is said to be a sign of a later author.

Answer.—Johanan is not mentioned as high-priest in Ezra's time. As heir to that office he had a chamber adjoining the temple. Since a grandson of Eliashib is known to have been married in 432 B.C. (Neh. 13:28)

why may not another grandson have been a youth when Ezra wrote (450-445 B.C.)?

7. The title "king of Persia" (Ezra 1:1 to 2:8; 3:7; 4:3, 5, 7, 24; 7:1) is said to indicate another and later author. In the "I" passages Ezra speaks simply of "the king" (Ezra 7:27; 8:1, 22, 25, 36) as in the documents quoted (Ezra 4:8, etc.). It is affirmed that after the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus, his title and that of his successors was "King of Babylon," "King of the lands," etc.

Answer.—The titles "the king" and "king of Persia" are found together in the same passage (Ezra 1:1-2, 7-8; 7:1, 7) interchangeably as an Englishman might speak of "the king of England" or of "the king." The title "king of Persia" occurs in a document of Cyrus (Ezra 1:2) and in at least one genuine passage of Ezra (9:9). Darius calls himself "king of Persia" in the Behistun inscription. Thus there is sufficient authority for it in Ezra's time.

The traditional view, that Ezra wrote this entire book is sustained. The Aramaic documents are embedded in the history and the book displays a uniform plan throughout. It was written during the period of adversity which preceded the arrival of Nehemiah. Since the latter event occurred in 445 B.C. the book may be dated 450-445 B.C.

VI. **Chronology.**

The decree of Cyrus allowing return from the Exile	536 B.C.
Cambyses	529-521 B.C.
Pseudo-Smerdis (seven months)	521 B.C.
Darius Hystaspis	521-485 B.C.
Rebuilding of the temple	520-516 B.C.

Xerxes I	485-465 B.C.
Artaxerxes I (Longimanus)	465-425 B.C.
Ezra's Mission to Jerusalem	458 B.C.
Nehemiah appointed Governor of Judea	445 B.C.
Xerxes II (two months)	425 B.C.
Sogdianus (seven months)	425 B.C.
Darius II (Nothus)	424-395 B.C.

(2) *Nehemiah*

I. **Name.** In modern editions of the Hebrew Bible the book is named נְחֶמְיָה from its alleged author (Neh. 1:1) and principal character, although in ancient times it was counted with Ezra. The name means "whom Jehovah hath comforted." In the Septuagint it is named *Νεεμίας* and in the Vulgate Liber secundus Esdræ or Liber Nehemiæ. The English form of the name follows the Hebrew.

II. **Theme.** Though like Ezra written from the priestly standpoint, the Book of Nehemiah is more secular than Ezra. A space of several years intervened between the last events recorded in Ezra and the first in Nehemiah. During this time the reforms instituted by Ezra seem to have been largely undone and the people of Jerusalem to have come under the oppression of foreigners. The Book of Nehemiah records his mission from Shushan to Jerusalem in 445 B.C., the building of the wall, the opposition he encountered from Sanballat and Tobijah, the reforms he instituted, his second mission to Jerusalem in 433 B.C., his further reforms and the census of the princes, priests, and Levites.

III. **Divisions.**

1. Chapters 1-7. The rebuilding of the walls and the reforms instituted at Nehemiah's first visit.

2. Chapters 8-10. The public reading of the Law. The keeping of the feast of tabernacles and the covenant to keep the Law.

3. Chapter 11-13. Lists of princes, priests and

Levites. The reforms of Nehemiah at his second visit in 433 B.C.

IV. **Authorship and Composition.**

The book is considered by the critics one with Ezra and both are assigned to the same author as Chronicles in the beginning of the Greek period (333 B.C.). Like Ezra, Nehemiah is considered a compilation based in part upon memoirs of Nehemiah himself. Neh. 1:1 to 7:73 is admitted to be almost word for word from Nehemiah, while chapters 11, 12 (27-43) and 13 (1-31) are thought to be slightly altered from Nehemiah. The remainder of the book is assigned to a later writer.

The *arguments for the critical position* are as follows:

1. Part of the book is in the third person and Nehemiah is mentioned (8:1-6 etc.). Nehemiah is called the Tirshatha (8:9; 10:1) although he calls himself Pehah (5:14, 18; 12:26).

Answer.—This may be explained satisfactorily in the same manner as in the Book of Ezra. The passages in which the third person is used are state documents or such as require the mention of Nehemiah officially by his name and title. The official Persian title Tirshatha is found in the more formal passages and the commoner Pehah in the more personal.

2. Jaddua, the high-priest in B.C. 351-331, who held office when Alexander the Great entered the city, is mentioned (Neh. 12:11, 22).

Answer.—The references to Jaddua occur in a catalogue of priests and Levites which is not an essential part of the book and might have been a later addition. Even this conclusion, however, is made unnecessary when we see that Jaddua is not mentioned as holding the office of high-priest at the time. He was the great

grandson of Eliashib, the high-priest in Nehemiah's day. Since Nehemiah mentions a grandson of Eliashib as married in his time (13:28) why may he not have lived to see Eliashib's great-grandson and mention him as an heir to the priesthood? This is confirmed by the tradition that Jaddua was very old when Alexander entered the city (332 B.C.). If he were ninety at that time, he might have been known to Nehemiah throughout his boyhood. At any rate he and the others with him are mentioned as living in the days of Nehemiah and Ezra (12:26).

3. Darius the Persian, mentioned in the same verse as Jaddua, is thought from the context to be Darius Codomannus (336-332 B.C.) Neh. 12:22.

Answer.—Since this verse mentions Jaddua not as high-priest but as heir to that office and in his boyhood, the Darius is Darius Nothus (424-395 B.C.).

4. The days of Nehemiah are mentioned as far past (Neh. 12:26, 47).

Answer.—In each case the expression "days of Nehemiah" is in connection with that of the days of some one before his time. It is natural that Nehemiah should use a similar expression concerning his own time to that which he had used concerning the times of his predecessors.

Over against these arguments for a late date the internal evidence strongly indicates that the book was written by Nehemiah. It is headed: "the words of Nehemiah, the son of Hachaliah" and Nehemiah speaks in the first person many times. Its composition may be placed in the reign of Darius Nothus (424-395 B.C.). It was written in the time of Malachi.

III

CHRONICLES

I. **Name.** These two books were originally one. In the Hebrew Bibles the name is דִּבְרֵי הַיָּמִים meaning annals (I Chron. 27:24). In the Septuagint they are separated and called *Παραλειπομένων πρῶτον* and *δεύτερον*. This term means "omissions" and is thought by some to refer to the fact that these books contain many things not found in Samuel and Kings. The Vulgate transliterates this name (Liber primus Paralipomenon and Liber secundus Paralipomenon). Jerome however translates דִּבְרֵי הַיָּמִים by Chronicon—hence the English name Chronicles. The division into two books was introduced into the Hebrew Bible in the printed edition of Daniel Bomberg (1517 A.D.).

II. **Theme.** From the position of the Books of Chronicles in the Hebrew canon and the examination of their contents, their main points of distinction from the Books of Samuel and Kings are clearly seen. While the Books of Samuel and Kings are written from the prophetic standpoint, the Chronicles are from the priestly.

1. Very great prominence is given to genealogies as was to be expected from a priest. They are carried back into the history covered by the books before Samuel.

2. In dealing with the history of the kings the priestly Chronicler naturally omits the history of Saul and of the northern kingdom, since Saul was not of the

faithful line and since the history of Israel furnished no material for the unfolding of his subject, the development of the true worship of Jehovah at Jerusalem. In particular he omits the history of Elijah and Elisha whose ministry was in the northern kingdom and to whom the prophetic writer of Kings naturally gave great prominence because they marked a stage in the development of prophetism.

3. On the other hand the Chronicler gives a fuller account than Kings of all those things which relate to the priestly worship. Such are the arrangements of the Levites and the temple-singers, David's preparations for building the temple, the devotion of the Kings of Judah to the temple worship, and the relation of the rightful kings of David's dynasty to the worship of Jehovah in Jerusalem. Thus the Chronicles furnish a history of the priestly worship from the death of Saul to the decree of Cyrus, the very point where the Book of Ezra takes up the history.

III. **Divisions.** Since these books continue the history without a break at the disruption of the kingdom under Jeroboam, they are properly divided into two parts.

1. Genealogies, especially those relating to the faithful tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi from Adam to the death of Saul and Jonathan. I Chron. 1-10.

2. The history of the kingdom of Judah from the accession of David to the decree of Cyrus permitting the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem. I Chron. 11 to II Chron. 36. The greater prominence given to the reigns of David and Solomon is due to their special activity concerning the worship of the temple.

IV. **Date and Authorship.** According to *current*

critical opinion, the Books of Chronicles were written soon after the beginning of the Greek period (about 300 B.C.) and by the same author as Ezra and Nehemiah. The arguments for this position are as follows:

1. The genealogy in I Chron. 3:17-24 is said to be carried down to the sixth or according to the Septuagint (which is preferred by Cornill and others) to the eleventh generation after Zerubbabel. Thus it extends several generations after Ezra and could not have been written by him.

Answer.—The critics admit that this is the only historical evidence of a late date in these books. An examination of the passage does not warrant the conclusion derived from it. In this chapter the author gives the descendants of David. In verses 19-20 he mentions the sons of Zerubbabel and in verse 21a the grandsons of Zerubbabel. Then verse 21b reads: "The sons of Rephaiah, the sons of Arnan, the sons of Obadiah, the sons of Shecaniah." Now there is no evidence whatever that these are four successive generations after the grandsons of Zerubbabel. The usual formula changes after verse 21a and these four names are added to the genealogy out of the chronological order. The argument from the reading of the Septuagint need not be considered, because the evidence shows that the text of the Septuagint is not as reliable, as the Massoretic text.

2. The language of Chronicles is said to be late.

Answer.—True, but since it is acknowledged to be like the language of Ezra and Nehemiah, the books are admitted by the critics to have come from the same time. The time was that of Ezra and Nehemiah.

3. Since the critics affirm that Ezra and Nehemiah

were written by the Chronicler, the arguments for a later date of these books are applied also to Chronicles.

Answer.—These arguments have been met in their proper place. Since they are not sufficient to prove the books of Ezra and Nehemiah later than those authors, they cannot prove Chronicles later than Ezra.

The mention of the Persian coin "darics" (I Chron. 29:7) shows that the books were written before the beginning of the Greek period. Nor can this word indicate a time in the Persian period after Darius Hystaspis and so after Ezra, for Sayce refers to the use of that word under Nabonidus and affirms that it was borrowed by the Persians from the Babylonians (Introduction to Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther pp. 40-41).

The traditional Jewish view considered Ezra the author of Chronicles. While this cannot be proved, the position of the book in the canon, the closing of its history at the very point where that of Ezra begins and its style make it possible if not probable. At any rate the date of the book must have been about 450-425 B.C. The fact that Ezra is a continuation of it, seems to indicate that Chronicles was written first and if so about 450 B.C.

V. **Sources.** The Chronicler makes extensive use of the official records of Israel as well as of the books of the Pentateuch, Samuel and Kings. The extra-canonical books referred to by him are the Book of Nathan the prophet (I Chron. 29:29; II Chron. 9:29), the Book of Gad the seer (I Chron. 29:29), the Prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite (II Chron. 9:29), the Visions of Iddo the seer (II Chron. 9:29; 12:15), the Book of Shemaiah the prophet (II Chron. 12:15), the Com-

mentary of the prophet Iddo (II Chron. 13:22) and the commentary of the book of the Kings (II Chron. 24:27). The book of the Kings which he possessed seems also to have contained matter not found in our Book of Kings (I Chron. 9:1; II Chron. 27:7; 33:18; 36:8).

VI. **Credibility.** On account of the alleged lateness of the book and of the sources referred to in it, its evident didactic aim, its variations from Samuel and Kings especially in the use of larger numbers, and the improbability of some of its independent statements, the Book of Chronicles is considered by many critics a work of secondary historical value, decidedly inferior to the Books of Samuel and Kings.

On the other hand there are several considerations which indicate the *trustworthiness of these books.*

1. The fact that he referred to his authorities at all shows that the Chronicler was not a careless historian. This he does more than any other Old Testament writer.

2. The noteworthy agreement in most particulars between Samuel and Kings on the one hand and Chronicles on the other is evidence of the reliability of Chronicles. Some of the divergences may be due to textual errors, others can be easily reconciled, and the remainder could be reconciled if our knowledge of the full facts of the history were complete. Since the Chronicler had the books of Samuel and Kings before him and held them in high esteem, it is not likely that he would insert statements in his book in direct opposition to them.

3. The priestly tone and purpose of the books no more discredit them than the prophetic tone and purpose of Samuel and Kings discredit those books. There is no

evidence that this purpose caused the Chronicler to misrepresent the facts. Indeed the priestly origin of the author confirms his statements on points where a priest would be specially informed by Levitical tradition.

4. There is a greater probability of textual errors in the numbers than in any other elements of the book. But the same is true of the numbers of all other books of the Old Testament. Errors of this kind in the existing text are no evidence of general inaccuracy in the record.

5. As in the Book of Daniel mere improbabilities in statements are certainly only a secondary argument against the credibility of the book.

DATES OF OLD TESTAMENT BOOKS

	B.C.
Pentateuch	1300
Joshua	1200
Judges	1050
Samuel	1025
Kings	Soon after 586
Isaiah	758-697
Jeremiah	627-586
Ezekiel	592-570
Hosea	785-725
Joel	875-865
Amos	795-785
Obadiah	742-726
Jonah	825-784
Micah	745-700
Nahum	623
Habakkuk	608-600
Zephaniah	626-621
Haggai	520
Zechariah	520-475
Malachi	433
Psalms	1075-425
Proverbs	1000-700
Job	1000
Song of Solomon	1000

DATES OF OLD TESTAMENT BOOKS

	B.C.
Ruth	1050
Lamentations	586
Ecclesiastes	433
Esther	Before 425
Daniel	605-539
Ezra	450-445
Nehemiah	420
Chronicles	450

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Entire Subject.

Keil. Introduction to the Old Testament. Edinburgh 1869.

W. R. Smith. The Old Testament in the Jewish Church. New York 1881.

Wellhausen. Prolegomena to the History of Israel. Edinburgh 1885.

C. H. H. Wright. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York 1891.

König. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Bonn 1893.

Sayce. Higher Criticism and the Monuments. London 1894.

Strack. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Munich 1898.

Kautzsch. The Literature of the Old Testament. London 1898.

Baudissin. Die Bücher des Alten Testamentes. Leipzig 1901.

Gigot. Special Introduction. New York 1901.

Driver. Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. Edinburgh 1902.

McFadyen. Old Testament Criticism and the Christian Church. New York 1903.

Whitelaw. Old Testament Critics. London 1903.

McFadyen. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York 1905.

Orr. The Problem of the Old Testament. New York 1906.

Cornill. Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament. New York 1907.

General Introduction.

Buhl. Canon and Text of the Old Testament. Edinburgh 1892.

Green. General Introduction. New York. 1899.

Gigot. General Introduction. New York 1901.

1. The Canon.

Reuss. History of the Canon. Edinburgh 1887.

S. Davidson. Canon of the Old Testament. London 1876.

Ryle. Canon of the Old Testament. London 1892.

Wildeboer. Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament. London 1895.

2. The Text.

Studia Biblica. Vol. III. Oxford 1891.

Coppinger. The Bible and its Transmission. London 1897.

Ginsburg. Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible. London 1897.

Kittel. Über die Notwendigkeit und Möglichkeit Einer Neuen Ausgebe der Hebräischen Bibel. Leipzig 1902

3. The Semitic Languages.

Renan. Histoire generale des langues semitiques. Paris 1863.

Fried. Delitzsch. Prolegomena eines neuen Hebr-Aram. Wörterbuchs. Leipzig 1886.

W. Wright. Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. Cambridge 1890.

Zimmern. Vergleichende Grammatik der Semitischen Sprachen. Berlin 1898.

Nöldeke. Die Semitischen Sprachen. Leipzig 1899. (Based upon the article "Semitic Languages" in the Encyclopedia Britannica.)

König. Hebräisch und Semitisch. 1901.

The Pentateuch.

Green. The Pentateuch Vindicated. New York 1863.

Keil and Delitzsch. Commentary. Edinburgh 1875.

Green. Hebrew Feasts. New York 1885.

Bissell. The Pentateuch. New York 1885.

Vos. Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes. New York 1886.

Kuenen. The Hexateuch. London 1886.

Briggs. Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch. New York 1893.

Rupprecht. Das Rätsel des Fünfbuches Mose. Gütersloh 1894.
French (Editor). Lex Mosaica. London 1894.
Hommel. The Ancient Hebrew Tradition. New York 1897.
W. Möller. Are the Critics Right? New York 1899.
Margoliouth. Lines of Defence of a Biblical Revelation. New York 1902.
McFadyen. Messages of the Prophetic and Priestly Historians. New York 1901.
Green. Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch. New York 1902.

1. Genesis.
T. Lewis in Lange's Commentary. New York 1884.
Delitzsch. New Commentary. New York 1889.
Bacon. The Genesis of Genesis. Hartford 1892.
Strack in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Munich 1894.
Dillmann. Commentary. Edinburgh 1897.
Green. Unity of Genesis. New York 1897.
Ryle. Early Narratives of Genesis. London 1900.
Dods in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
Mitchell. The World before Abraham. New York 1901.
Gunkel in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1902.
Driver. The Book of Genesis. New York 1904.

2. Exodus.
Mead in Lange's Commentary. New York 1876.
Bacon. Exodus. Hartford 1894.
Strack in Kurzegefasster Kommentar. Munich 1894.
Chadwick in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
Baentsch in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1903.

3. Leviticus.
Bonar. Commentary. New York 1851.
Kalisch. Historical and Critical Commentary. London 1872.
Strack in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Munich 1894.
Kellogg in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
Baentsch in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1903.

4. Numbers.
Dillmann in Kurzgefasstes Exeg. Handbuch. Leipzig 1886.

Strack in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Munich 1894.
Watson in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
Baentsch in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1903.
Gray in International Critical Commentary. New York 1903.

5. Deuteronomy.

Dillmann in Kurzgefasstes Exeg. Handbuch. Leipzig 1886.
Oettli in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Munich 1893.
Driver in International Critical Commentary. New York 1895.
A. Harper in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
Steuernagel in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1900.

Joshua.

Keil. Commentary. Edinburgh 1857.
Keil and Delitsch. Edinburgh 1869.
Maclear in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1880.
Dillman in Kurzgefasstes Exeg. Handbuch. Leipzig 1886.
Strack in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Munich 1894.
Steuernagel in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1900.
Blaikie in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
McFadyen. Messages of the Prophetic and Priestly Historians. New York 1901.

Judges.

Keil and Delitzsch. Edinburgh 1869.
Oettli in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Munich 1893.
Moore in International Critical Commentary. New York 1895.
Lias in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1896.
Watson in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
McFadyen. Messages of Prophetic and Priestly Historians. New York 1901.
Nowack in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1902.

Samuel.

Keil and Delitzsch. Edinburgh 1866.
Kirkpatrick in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1881.

Klostermann in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Nördlingen 1887.
Driver. Notes on the Text of Samuel. Oxford 1890.
Edersheim. Bible History. New York 1894.
Girdlestone. Deuterographs. Oxford 1894.
Crockett. Harmony of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles. New York 1897.
H. P. Smith in International Critical Commentary. New York 1899.
Blaikie in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
McFadyen. Messages of the Prophetic and Priestly Historians. New York 1901.
Nowack in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1902.

Kings.

Keil and Bertheau. Commentary. Edinburgh 1857.
Klostermann in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Nördlingen 1887.
Edersheim. Bible History. New York 1894.
Girdlestone. Deuterographs. Oxford 1894.
Lumby in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1896.
Crockett. Harmony of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles. New York 1897.
Farrar in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
Kittel in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1900.
McFadyen. Messages of the Prophetic and Priestly Historians. New York 1901.
Burney. Notes on the Hebrew Text of Kings. Oxford 1903.

Hebrew Prophecy.

Fairbairn. Prophecy. New York 1866.
Hengstenberg. Christology of the Old Testament. Edinburgh 1868.
Payne Smith. Prophecy a Preparation for Christ. London 1869.
Gloag. Messianic Prophecies. Edinburgh 1879.
W. R. Smith. The Prophets of Israel. New York 1882.
Edersheim. Prophecy and History. London 1885.
Orelli. Old Testament Prophecy. Edinburgh 1885.

Briggs. Messianic Prophecy. New York 1886.
Delitzsch. Messianic Prophecy. New York 1891.
Kirkpatrick. Doctrine of the Prophets. London 1892.
Woods. The Hope of Israel. Edinburgh 1896.
Cornill. The Prophets of Israel. Chicago 1897.
Riehm. Messianic Prophecy. Edinburgh 1900.
Goodspeed. Israel's Messianic Hope. New York 1900.
Davidson. Old Testament Prophecy. Edinburgh 1904.
Batten. The Hebrew Prophet. New York 1905.
Beecher. The Prophets and the Promise. New York 1905.

Isaiah.

Alexander. Commentary. New York 1846.
Matthew Arnold. Isaiah 40-66. London 1875.
Cheyne. Commentary. London 1880.
Sayce. Times of Isaiah. New York (no date).
Delitzsch. Commentary. New York 1891.
Orelli in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Munich 1891.
Kennedy. Argument for Unity of Isaiah. London 1891.
Douglas. Isaiah One and His Book One. New York 1895.
Cheyne. Introduction to Book of Isaiah. London 1895.
Skinner in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1897-8.
König. Exiles' Book of Consolation. Edinburgh 1899.
Sanders and Kent. Messages of the Earlier Prophets. New York 1899.
Sanders and Kent. Messages of the Later Prophets. New York 1899.
G. A. Smith in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
Duhm in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1902.
Workman. The Servant of Jehovah. New York 1907.

Jeremiah.

Keil. Commentary. Edinburgh 1873.
Streane in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1881.
Orelli. Commentary. Edinburgh 1889.
Orelli in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Munich 1891.
Giesebrecht in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1894.
Sanders and Kent. Messages of the Earlier Prophets. New York 1899.
Ball in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.

Ezekiel.

Fairbairn. Commentary. Edinburgh 1863.
Keil. Edinburgh. 1866.
Hengstenberg. Edinburgh 1869.
Davidson in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1892.
Orelli in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Munich 1896.
Sanders and Kent. Messages of the Later Prophets. New York 1899.
Kraetzschmar in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1900.
Skinner in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.

Minor Prophets.

Hengstenberg. Christology of the Old Testament. Edinburg 1861.
Keil and Delitzsch. Edinburgh 1868.
Ewald. The Prophets of the Old Testament. London 1875.
Pusey. New York 1888.
Orelli. Edinburgh 1893.
Wellhausen. Die Kleinen Propheten. Berlin 1893.
Orelli in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Munich 1896.
Nowack in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1897.
Sanders and Kent. Messages of Earlier Prophets. New York 1899.
Sanders and Kent. Messages of the Later Prophets. New York 1899.
G. A. Smith in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.

Hosea.

Cheyne in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1884.
Harper in International Critical Commentary. New York 1905.

Joel.

Credner Halle 1831.
Driver in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1897.

Amos.

Driver in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1897.
Harper in International Critical Commentary. New York 1905.

Obadiah.
Perowne in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1898.

Jonah.
Kalisch. Bible Studies. London 1878.
Trumbull. Jonah in Nineveh. Philadelphia 1892.
Kennedy. On the Book of Jonah. London 1895.
Perowne in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1898.

Micah.
J. Taylor. Massoretic Text and Ancient Versions of Micah. London 1891.
Cheyne in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1895.

Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah.
Davidson in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1896.
Haupt. The Book of Nahum. New York 1907.

Haggai.
Perowne in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1897.

Zechariah.
David Kimchi (translated by A. McCaul). London 1837.
Wright (Bampton Lectures for 1878). London 1879.
Rubinkam. Second Part of Book of Zechariah. Basel 1892.
Perowne in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1897.

Malachi.
Perowne in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1896.

Hebrew Poetry.
Lowth. Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews. Andover 1829.
Herder. The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry. Burlington (Vt.) 1833.
I. Taylor. The Spirit of the Hebrew Poetry. London 1861.
Margoliouth. Poetry of the Hebrew Pentateuch. London 1871.
Ewald in Appendix of Commentary on Psalms. London 1881.
Drysdale. Early Bible Songs. London 1890.

Casonowicz. Paranomasia in the Old Testament. Boston 1894.
Briggs. General Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament. New York 1899.
König. Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetic. 1900.

Psalms.

Alexander. Psalms. New York 1852.
Hengstenberg. Psalms. Edinburgh 1869.
Delitzsch. Psalms. Edinburgh 1873.
Fausset. Studies in the Psalms. London 1873.
Ewald. Psalms. London 1880.
Murray. Origin and Growth of the Psalms. New York 1880.
Spurgeon. Treasury of David. New York 1882.
Ker. The Psalms in History and Biography. New York 1886.
Van Dyke. The Story of the Psalms. New York 1887.
Wm. Alexander. Witness of the Psalms to Christ (Bampton Lectures). London 1890.
Walsh. Voices of the Psalms. New York 1890.
Cheyne. Historical Origin and Religious Ideas of the Psalter (Bampton Lectures). London 1891.
De Witt. The Psalms. New York 1891.
Perowne. The Psalms. London 1892.
Kirkpatrick in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1897.
Baethgen in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1897.
James Robertson. The Poetry and Religion of the Psalms. New York 1898.
Davison. The Praises of Israel. London 1898.
Kessler in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Munich 1899.
Alexander Wright. The Psalms of David and the Higher Criticism. London 1900.
Cheyne. The Christian Use of the Psalms. New York 1900.
Maclaren in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
Prothero. The Psalms in Human Life. New York 1903.
Cheyne. The Book of Psalms. New York 1904.
Thirtle. The Titles of the Psalms. New York 1904.

Briggs in International Critical Commentary. New York 1906-7.
Thirtle. Old Testament Problems. Critical Studies in the Psalms and Isaiah. New York 1907.

Proverbs.

Delitzsch. The Proverbs. Edinburgh 1874.
Cheyne. Job and Solomon. New York 1887.
Davison. Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament. London 1894.
Kent. The Wise Men of Ancient Israel. Boston 1895.
Frankenberg in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1898.
Strack in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Munich 1899.
Perowne in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1899.
Toy in International Critical Commentary. New York 1899.
Horton in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.

Job.

Hengstenberg in Commentary on Ecclesiastes. Philadelphia 1860.
Delitzsch. Job. Edinburgh 1866.
Froude. Short Stories on Great Subjects (Series 1). New York 1870.
Green. Argument of the Book of Job. New York 1873.
Godet in Biblical Studies on the Old Testament. London 1879.
Davidson in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1884.
Cheyne. Job and Solomon. New York 1887.
Bradley. Lectures on Job. Oxford 1887.
Gilbert. The Poetry of Job. Chicago 1889.
Volck in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Nördlingen 1889.
Budde in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1896.
Watson in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
Genung. Epic of the Inner Life. New York 1900.
Peloubet. Studies in the Book of Job. New York 1906.

Song of Solomon.

Ginsburg. The Song of Songs. London 1857.
Hengstenberg in Commentary on Ecclesiastes. Philadelphia 1860.

A. M. Stuart. Song of Songs. London 1877.
Cheyne. Job and Solomon. New York 1887.
Oettli in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Nördlingen 1889.
Griffis. The Lily among Thorns. New York 1890.
Delitzsch. Song of Songs. Edinburgh 1891.
Siegfried in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1898.
Adeney in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.

Ruth.

Wright. The Book of Ruth. London 1864.
Keil. Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. Edinburgh 1875.
Oettli in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Nördlingen 1889.
Watson in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
Nowack in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1902.

Lamentations.

Keil in Commentary on Jeremiah. Edinburgh 1874.
Streane in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1881.
Ewald in Psalms Vol. II. London 1881.
Oettli in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Nördlingen 1889.
Lohr in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1893.
Adeney in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.

Ecclesiastes.

Hengstenberg. Commentary. Philadelphia 1860.
Ginsburg. Coheleth. London 1861.
Plumptre in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1881.
Wright. Donnellan Lectures. London 1883.
Bradley. Lectures on Ecclesiastes. Oxford 1885
Cheyne. Job and Solomon. New York 1887.
Volck in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Nördlingen 1889.
Delitzsch. Commentary. Edinburgh 1891.
Siegfried in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1898.
Cox in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
Genung. Words of Koheleth. New York 1904.
Barton in International Critical Commentary. New York 1908.

Esther.

Keil. Commentary. Edinburgh 1873.

Sayce. Introduction to Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. London 1885.
Oettli in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Nördlingen 1889.
Haley. The Book of Esther. Andover 1895.
Adeney in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
Siegfried in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1901.
Paton in International Critical Commentary. New York 1908.

Daniel.

Stuart. Commentary. Boston 1850.
Tregelles. Defence of the Authenticity of Daniel. London 1852.
Fuller. Essay on the Authenticity of Daniel. Cambridge 1864.
Meinhold in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Nördlingen 1889.
Pusey. Daniel the Prophet. New York 1891.
Keil. Commentary. Edinburgh 1891.
Bevan. Short Commentary on Daniel. Cambridge 1892.
Behrmann in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1894.
Kennedy. The Book of Daniel from the Christian's Standpoint. London 1898.
Prince. Commentary. New York 1899.
Farrar in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
Driver in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1900.
Anderson. Daniel in the Critics' Den. New York 1902.

Ezra and Nehemiah.

Keil. Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther. Edinburgh 1873.
Sayce. Introduction to Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther. London 1885.
Oettli in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Nördlingen 1889.
Hunter. After the Exile. Edinburgh 1890.
Ryle in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1893.
Torrey. The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra and Nehemiah. Giessen 1896.
Adeney in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
Siegfried in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1901.

Chronicles.

Keil. Chronicles. Edinburgh 1872.
Oettli in Kurzgefasster Kommentar. Nördlingen 1889.
Girdlestone. Deuterographs. Oxford 1894.
Crockett. Harmony of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles. New York 1897.
Barnes in Cambridge Bible. Cambridge 1899.
Bennett in Expositor's Bible. New York 1900.
Kittel in Hand Kommentar. Göttingen 1902.

4 PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DATE DUE

BS
1140
.R253o
1910

790

BOMBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BS1140.R253o 1910
Raven, John H Old Testament introduction
3 0645 0005 1527 6